

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF INDIA

CENTRAL
ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

ACCESSION NO. 57926.

CALL No. 737.55 / N.C.


D.G.A. 79.

London,
Vth Series

Vol 15

Pts 2-4

1935



PRICE TEN SHILLINGS

THE
NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE

AND
JOURNAL *Pts. 2-4*

OF THE

ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

EDITED BY

J. ALLAN, M.A., F.S.A.

KEEPER OF COINS, BRITISH MUSEUM

AND

E. S. G. ROBINSON, M.A., F.S.A.

ACTING DEPUTY KEEPER OF COINS, BRITISH MUSEUM

5th series

Vol 15

Pts 2-4

1935

1935 — PART II — IV



57926

Factum ablit—monumenta manent.—Ov. Fast.

FIFTH SERIES—No. 58

Pts. 2-4, 1935

LONDON:

BERNARD QUARITCH, 11 GRAFTON ST., W. 1

PARIS:

MM. ROLLIN ET FEUARDENT, PLACE LOUVOIS, No. 4

1935

Printed in Great Britain by John Johnson at the OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1934—1935

THE ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

22 RUSSELL SQUARE, LONDON, W.C. 1.

Patron:

HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

President:

SIR

F.B.A.

C.B., M.A., LL.D., D.LITT

PROFESSOR SIR C

LL.D., F.S.A.

M.A., D.C.L.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq.

Honorary

SIR GEORGE HILL, K.C.B., M.A.,

V.P.S.A., F.B.A.

Treasurer:

G. C. HAINES, Esq., F.S.A., 31 LARPENT AVENUE, S.

Secretaries:

JOHN ALLAN, Esq., M.A., F.S.A.

HAROLD MATTINGLY, Esq., M.A.

Foreign Secretary:

V. B. CROWTHER-BEYNON, Esq., M.B.E., M.A., F.S.A.

Librarian:

FREDERICK A. HARRISON, Esq., F.Z.S.

Members of the Council:

LADY EVANS, M.A. (OXON. AND DUBL.).

HENRY GARSIDE, Esq.

WILLIAM GILBERT, Esq., M.S.A.

HENRY PLATT HALL, Esq.

L. A. LAWRENCE, Esq., F.R.C.S., F.S.A.

R. C. LOCKETT, Esq., F.S.A.

B. H. ST. J. O'NEIL, Esq., M.A., F.S.A.

REV. E. A. SYDENHAM, M.A.

JOHN WALKER, Esq., M.A., M.R.A.S.

R. B. WHITEHEAD, Esq., M.A., F.A.S.B., M.R.A.S.

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY, NEW DELHI.

Acc. No 20520

Date 28.7.1975

Call No..... 757.05

N.C.

LIST OF PLATES CONTAINED IN VOL. XV.

- I-II. Coins of Corinth and Colonies.
 - III-V. Himera and Selinus.
 - VI-VII. Antioch and Viminacium?
 - VIII. Solidi of Constantine VII.
 - IX. A New Byzantine Mint.
 - X-XII. Siliquae of Treviri.
 - XIII-XVI. The Larnaca Hoard.
 - XVIII. Oriental Acquisitions of the British Museum.
 - XIX-XX. South Ferriby Theodosian Hoard.
-

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY (separately paged).

LIST OF FELLOWS (separately paged).

	PAGE
ROBERTSON, MISS ANNE S.—The Linwood (March) Hoard	57
——— The St. Mary Cray Hoard	62
——— The Edlington Find	202
ROBINSON, E. S. G.—Notes on the Larnaca Hoard . .	180
——— Note on a Stater of Idalium	283
SUTHERLAND, C. H. V.—The Whitechurch Hoard of Radiate Minimi	16
——— Roman Coins from Carthage	53
SYDENHAM, REV. E. A.—The Origin of the Roman Serrati	209
WALKER, JOHN.—A New Byzantine Mint, and some early Umayyad Bronze Coins	120

ENGLISH NUMISMATICS.

BARNARD, F. P.—The "Birmingham Halfpence" of the Eighteenth Century	286
LAWRENCE, L. A.—A New Mint for the first Issue of Henry II	38
——— The Brooke Memorial	135
MILNE, J. G.—The Harrington Farthing	45
——— A Note on the Hawkirke Find	292
PERSON, E.—The Torlarp Find	42
WOOD, HOWLAND.—The First British Coinage for the Ionian Islands	47

MEDIÆVAL NUMISMATICS.

ALLAN, J.—A New Sterling of Lorraine	208
DIEUDONNÉ, A.—Le Hardi et le Liard	25

ORIENTAL NUMISMATICS.

ALLOTTE DE LA FUÏE.—Monnaies inédites des Kākway- hids	68
WALKER, JOHN.—Some Recent Oriental Coin Acquisi- tions of the British Museum	241
WHITEHEAD, R. B.—Mir Ja'far's Plassey Medal . . .	127

CONTENTS.

ANCIENT NUMISMATICS.

	PAGE
ASKEW, GILBERT.—A Blackmoor Hoard	55
CLARKE, RAINBIRD.—A Theodosian Hoard from Norfolk	67
DIKAIOS, P. M.—A Hoard of Silver Cypriot Staters from Larnaca	165
———— A Silver Stater of Idalium	282
GOODACRE, HUGH.—The Story of Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus, from his solidi	114
———— A Nomisma of Andronicus III, Anna and John V	232
LAWRENCE, L. A.—Note on Serrated Coins	230
LOYD, A. H.—The Coin Types of Selinus and the Legend of Empedocles	73
MATTINGLY, HAROLD.—A Hoard of Roman Denarii from Spain (Ramallas)	289
MILNE, J. G.—Notes on the Oxford Collection. (1) Greek Coins of Northern Asia Minor	191
O'NEIL, B. H. ST. J.—An earlier Find near St. Mary Cray	66
———— The South Ferriby Theodosian Hoard	254
———— Some Stratified Coins of c. A.D. 390–400 from Bourton-on-the-Water	275
———— A Hoard of <i>Minimissimi</i> from near Bourton-on- the-Water	284
PEARCE, J. W. E.—A Late Roman Hoard from South-west Asia Minor	21
———— The Woodbridge Find	49
———— Aes of Valentinian II and Theodosius	72
———— <i>Siliqua</i> Issues at Treveri from the death of Valens to the accession of Magnus Maximus	137
PINK, KARL.—Antioch or Viminacium?	94
RAVEL, O.—Rare and Unpublished Coins of Corinthian Types	1

Printed in Great Britain at the
UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
By John Johnson
Printer to the University

THE
NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE
AND
JOURNAL
OF THE
ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

EDITED BY
J. ALLAN, M.A., F.S.A.
KEEPER OF COINS, BRITISH MUSEUM
AND
E. S. G. ROBINSON, M.A., F.S.A.
ACTING DEPUTY KEEPER OF COINS, BRITISH MUSEUM

FIFTH SERIES—VOL. XV



Factum abiit—monumenta manent.—Ov. Fast.

LONDON:
BERNARD QUARITCH, 11 GRAFTON ST., W. 1

PARIS:
MM. ROLLIN ET FEUARDENT, PLACE LOUVOIS, No. 4

1935

THE
NUMISMATIC CHRONICLE
AND
JOURNAL OF
THE ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

LIST OF FELLOWS
OF THE
ROYAL
NUMISMATIC SOCIETY
1935



PATRON

HIS MAJESTY THE KING

LIST OF FELLOWS

OF THE

ROYAL

NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

1935

*The sign * indicates that the Fellow has compounded for his annual contribution : † that the Fellow has died during the year.*

ELECTED

- 1920 ABBOTT, GEORGE HENRY, Esq., B.A., M.B., C.M., 185 Macquarie Street, Sydney, N.S.W.
- 1931 ADCOCK, PROFESSOR, F. E., O.B.E., M.A., D.Litt., King's College, Cambridge.
- 1907 ALLAN, JOHN, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., *Keeper of Coins and Medals*, British Museum, W.C. 1, *Hon. Secretary*.
- 1935 ALLEN, DEREK F., Esq., B.A., British Museum., W.C. 1.
- 1933 ARMITAGE, T. W., Esq., Trent Lock, Long Eaton, Nottingham.
- 1907 BAIRD, REV. ANDREW B., D.D., The Library, Manitoba College, Winnipeg, Canada.
- 1902 BALDWIN, A. H., Esq., 3 Adelphi Terrace House, W.C. 2.
- 1923 BALDWIN, A. H. F., Esq., 3 Adelphi Terrace House, W.C. 2.
- 1933 BALDWIN, W. V. ROYLE, Esq., Flat 2, 24 Marine Parade, Worthing.
- 1909 BALDWIN BRETT, MRS A., 136-36 Maple Avenue, Flushing, New York, U.S.A.
- 1917 BARKER, A. LEIGH, Esq., M.A., Spreacombe Manor, Braunton, North Devon.
- 1906 BEATTY, W. GEDNEY, Esq., 247 Central Park West, New York, U.S.A.

ELECTED

- 1919 BEAZLEY, PROFESSOR J. D., M.A., Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
- 1934 BECKLAKE, J. T., Esq., Superintendent of the Royal Mint, Pretoria.
- 1920 BERNAYS, M. L'ÉCUYER EDOUARD, 204 Avenue Karel de Preter, Borgerhout, Antwerp, Belgium.
- 1933 *BIDDELL, W. H., Esq., Alta, Upper Lake Road, Kandy, Ceylon.
- 1923 BLUNT, C. E., Esq., 15 Gerald Road, S.W. 1.
- 1917 BORDONARO, BARON G. CHIARAMONTE, Palazzo Bordonaro, Piazza Municipio, Palermo, Sicily.
- 1932 *BRIGGS, LLOYD C., Esq., 64 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
- 1895 BRIGHTON PUBLIC LIBRARY, The Curator, Brighton.
- 1906 BRISTOL CENTRAL LIBRARY, The Librarian, Bristol.
- 1910 BRITTAN, FREDERICK J., Esq., 63 Bingham Road, Addiscombe, Croydon.
- 1930 BROOKE, W. A., Esq., Spring House, Thetford.
- 1930 BROWNE, CHRISTOPHER C., Esq., The Chestnuts, Bishops Stortford.
- 1924 BUNN, C. J., Esq., 125 Grove Lane, S.E. 5.
- 1897 BURN, SIR RICHARD, C.S.I., I.C.S. (retd.), M.R.A.S., 9 Staver-ton Road, Oxford.
- 1911 BURTON, FRANK E., Esq., J.P., F.S.A., Orston Hall, Notts.
- 1935 CAHN, HERBERT A., Aeschenvorstadt 37, Basle, Switzerland.
- 1904 CAHN, DR. JULIUS, Niedenau 55, Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany.
- 1886 CALDECOTT, J. B., Esq., Amberley, Arundel, Sussex.
- 1914 CAMERON, LT.-COL. J. S., D.S.O., Low Wood, Bethersden, Ashford, Kent.
- 1925 CARDIFF, Central Library, The Librarian.
- 1894 CARLYON-BRITTON, MAJOR P. W. P., D.L., J.P., F.S.A., Eversfield, Fishbourne, Chichester.
- 1923 CARLYON-BRITTON, RAYMOND, Esq., Eversfield, Fishbourne, Chichester.
- 1923 CARTWRIGHT, RICHARD, Esq., Aynho Park, Banbury.
- 1925 CHAMBERLAIN, JOHN A., Esq., 44 Barrington Road, S.W. 9.
- 1929 CHAPMAN, G. E., Esq., 14 Claremont Road, Tunbridge Wells.
- 1922 CHARLIER, M. PIERRE, 213 Grand Rue, Montignie-sur-Sambre, Belgium.

ELECTED

- 1929 CHECKLEY, JAMES F. H., Esq., L.R.I.B.A., 26 Maple Avenue, Maidstone.
- 1914 CICCIO, MONSIGNORE COMM. UFF. GIUSEPPE DE, 14 Parco Margherita, Naples, Italy.
- 1891 *CLAUSON, THE HON. SIR CHARLES, C.B.E., Hawkshead House, Hatfield, Herts.
- 1911 *COATES, R. ASSHETON, Esq., F.S.A.
- 1913 *CODRINGTON, HUMPHREY W., Esq., B.A., M.R.A.S., 43 Palace Gardens Terrace, W. 8.
- 1932 COPENHAGEN, The National Museum, Møntsamling.
- 1926 CÔTE, M. CLAUDIUS, 33 Rue du Plat, Lyons, France.
- 1902 COVERNTON, J. G., Esq., M.A., C.I.E., Parsonage House, Finchfield, Braintree, Essex.
- 1919 *CRASTER, H. H. E., Esq., M.A., D.Litt., Litt.D., F.S.A., *Bodley's Librarian*, Oxford.
- 1920 CROSS, A. PEARL, Esq., F.R.G.S., 35 St. Martin's Court, W.C. 2.
- 1914 CROWTHER-BEYNON, V. B., Esq., M.B.E., M.A., F.S.A., Westfield, Beckenham, Kent, *Foreign Secretary*.
- 1934 DAKERS, H. J., Esq., 3 Belmont Hill, St. Albans.
- 1930 DAVIS, A. W., Esq., British Embassy, Baghdad.
- 1926 DEACON, JAMES HUNT, Esq., Numismatic Section, The Art Gallery, Adelaide, South Australia.
- 1933 DENTON, ARTHUR RIDGWAY, Esq., The Myrtles, Haygate Road, Wellington, Shropshire.
- 1922 DICKSON, REV. W. H. FANE, Gorsley Vicarage, Gloucester.
- 1919 DRABBLE, G. C., Esq., Los Altos, Sandown, Isle of Wight.
- 1918 †EIDLITZ, ROBERT JAMES, Esq., 100 East 42nd Street, New York, U.S.A.
- 1920 EMPEDOCLES, G., Esq., 34 Academy Street, Athens, Greece.
- 1872 *EVANS, SIR ARTHUR J., M.A., D.Litt., LL.D., Ph.D., F.R.S., Hon. V.-P.S.A., F.B.A., Corr. de l'Inst., Youlbury, near Oxford.
- 1892 *EVANS, LADY, M.A. (Oxon.), 9 Kensington Park Gardens, W. 11.
- 1905 FAIRBAIRN, SIDNEY H., Esq., M.A., M.D., 11 Bolton Gardens, S.W. 5.
- 1904 *FARQUHAR, MISS HELEN, 6 Lowndes Street, S.W. 1.
- 1921 FAULKNER, W. J., Esq., Sutton House, Endon, Stoke-on-Trent.

ELECTED

- 1910 FISHER LIBRARY, THE, University, Sydney, N.S.W.
- 1908 FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM, The Director, Cambridge.
- 1898 FORRER, L., Esq., Helvetia, 24 Homefield Road, Bromley, Kent.
- 1928 FORRER, LEONARD STEYNING, Esq., Fair Mead, 1 Wanstead Road, Bromley, Kent.
- 1896 *FRY, CLAUDE BASIL, Esq., Hannington Hall, Highworth, Wilts.
- 1897 *GANS, LEOPOLD, Esq., 207 Maddison Street, Chicago, U.S.A.
- 1912 GANTZ, REV. W. L., M.A., C.F., St. Michael's Cottage, The Avenue, Camberley, Surrey.
- 1871 GARDNER, PROFESSOR PERCY, M.A., D.Litt., Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., 12 Canterbury Road, Oxford.
- 1907 GARDNER, WILLOUGHBY, Esq., D.Sc., F.S.A., F.L.S., F.R.G.S., Y Berffa, Deganwy, North Wales.
- 1889 GARSIDE, HENRY, Esq., 46 Queen's Road, Teddington, Middlesex.
- 1928 GAVIN, REV. CANON GORDON HAY, St. Mary's Vicarage, New Plymouth, Taranaki, New Zealand.
- 1913 GILBERT, WILLIAM, Esq., M.S.A., 74 Broad Street Avenue, E.C. 2.
- 1920 GINORI, MARCHESE ROBERTO VENTURI, 75 Via della Scala, Florence, Italy.
- 1894 GOODACRE, HUGH, Esq., Ullesthorpe Court, Lutterworth, Rugby.
- 1904 GRAHAM, T. HENRY BOILEAU, Esq., F.S.A., Oxford and Cambridge Club, Pall Mall, S.W. 1.
- 1891 *GRANTLEY, LORD, D.L., J.P., F.S.A., Weeke Manor, Winchester, Hants.
- 1914 GROSE, S. W., Esq., M.A., 18 Hobson Street, Cambridge.
- 1916 HAINES, GEOFFREY COLTON, Esq., F.S.A., 31 Larpent Avenue, Putney, London, S.W. 15, *Hon. Treasurer*.
- 1899 HALL, HENRY PLATT, Esq., Pentreheylin Hall, Llanymynech, Montgomeryshire.
- 1933 HANSEN, FRANTS JOHAN, Esq., Woodstock, Hurst Road, Bexley, Kent.
- 1904 HARRISON, FREDERICK A., Esq., F.Z.S., 40 Wembley Park Drive, Wembley, Middlesex, *Librarian*.
- 1916 *HART, R. EDWARD, Esq., M.A., Brooklands, Blackburn.

ELECTED

- 1934 HAYDN-MORRIS, HAROLD, Esq., Pokes, Hellingly, Sussex.
- 1928 HAYTER, G. C. F., Esq., B.A., F.S.A., 40 Arkwright Road, Hampstead, N.W. 3.
- 1931 HEDLEY, W. PERCY, Esq., F.S.A., F.G.S., Gresham House, Corbridge, Northumberland.
- 1934 HEITHAUS, REV. CLAUDE H., 6 Endsleigh Street, W.C. 1.
- 1930 HERZFELDER, HUBERT, Esq., 28 Prince's Gardens, S.W. 7.
- 1900 HEWLETT, LIONEL M., Esq., Greenbank, Byron Hill, Harrow-on-the-Hill, Middlesex.
- 1932 HILDYARD, E.W., Esq., Viver's Lodge, Kirby Moorside, Yorks.
- 1893 HILL, SIR GEORGE, K.C.B., M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Litt.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., *Director and Principal Librarian*, British Museum, W.C. 1, *Honorary Vice-President*.
- 1895 HODGE, THOMAS, Esq., Fyning House, Rogate, Petersfield, Hants.
- 1920 *HOLROYD, MICHAEL, Esq., M.A., F.S.A., Brasenose College, Oxford.
- 1908 *HUNTINGTON, ARCHER M., Esq., Honorary President of the American Numismatic Society, Audubon Park, 156th Street, West of Broadway, New York, U.S.A.
- 1922 JAMESON, Monsieur R., 8 Avenue Velasquez. Paris VIII^e.
- 1911 JOHNSTON, LEONARD P., Esq., The Cottage, Warningcamp, Arundel, Sussex.
- 1914 *KERR, ROBERT, Esq., M.A., Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh.
- 1920 KING, COLONEL E. J., C.M.G., A.D.C., M.A., F.S.A., F.R. Hist.Soc., The Old House, East End Road, N. 2.
- 1928 KRAUS, DR. FRANZ FERDINAND, 1 Friedensallee, Brunswick, Germany.
- 1917 LAMB, MISS WINIFRED, Holly Lodge, Campden Hill, W. 8.
- 1920 LAST, H. M., Esq., M.A., St. John's College, Oxford.
- 1885 *LAWRENCE, L. A., Esq., F.S.A., 44 Belsize Square, N.W. 3.
- 1883 *LAWRENCE, RICHARD HOE, Esq., Fifth Avenue Bank, New York, U.S.A.
- 1920 LEWIS, JOHN CAMPBELL, Esq., Bridge House, Troedyrhiw, Merthyr Tydfil, Wales.
- 1930 LINCOLN, F.W., Esq., 1 Midhurst Mansions, Muswell Hill, N.10.
- 1922 LLOYD, ALBERT H., Esq., Ph.D., F.S.A., St. John's House, 73 Grange Road, Cambridge.

ELECTED

- 1922 *LLOYD, MISS MURIEL ELEANOR HAYDON, St. John's House, 73 Grange Road, Cambridge.
- 1907 LOCKETT, RICHARD CYRIL, Esq., J.P., F.S.A., 58 Cadogan Place, S.W. 1.
- 1921 LUCKNOW MUSEUM, The Curator of the, Lucknow, India.
- 1934 *MABBOTT, PROF. T. O., 1232 Madison Avenue, New York City, U.S.A.
- 1895 MACDONALD, SIR GEORGE, K.C.B., M.A., LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., 17 Learmonth Gardens, Edinburgh, *President*.
- 1901 MACFADYEN, FRANK E., Esq., 17 St. George's Terrace, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
- 1923 MALLINSON, REV. ARNOLD, c/o St. Frideswide's Vicarage, Oxford.
- 1932 MARTIN, CAPTAIN M. F. C., R.E., Ardlonghor, Killylea, Co. Armagh.
- 1912 MATTINGLY, HAROLD, Esq., M.A., British Museum, W.C. 1, *Hon. Secretary*.
- 1905 MAVROGORDATO, J., Esq., Gilridge, Cowden Pound, Edenbridge, Kent.
- 1929 McNICKLE, A. J. S., Esq., c/o Royal Mail Steam Packet Co., Royal Mail House, E.C. 2.
- 1916 MEIGH, ALFRED, Esq., Dole Spring House, Forsbrook, Stoke-on-Trent.
- 1905 MESSENGER, LEOPOLD G. P., Esq., 151 Brecknock Road, Tufnell Park, N. 19.
- 1928 MIDDLETON, LAWRENCE H., Esq., M.A., 11 A High Street, N.W. 8.
- 1934 MIDDLETON, PIERCE, Esq., Ramsay Lodge, Edinburgh.
- 1929 MILBANK, S. R., Esq., Panfield, Huntingdon, New York, U.S.A.
- 1924 MILLER, HOYT, Esq., East Shore Road, Great Neck, Long Island, New York, U.S.A.
- 1897 MILNE, J. GRAFTON, Esq., M.A., D.Litt., 20 Bardwell Road, Oxford.
- 1921 MILNE, MRS. J. GRAFTON, 20 Bardwell Road, Oxford.
- 1932 MITCHELL, D. D., Esq., 19 Norman Avenue, St. Margaret's, Twickenham.
- 1910 MITCHELL LIBRARY, THE, Glasgow, The Librarian.
- 1888 MONTAGUE, LIEUT.-COL. L. A. D., Penton, near Crediton, Devon.
- 1933 MYERS, OLIVER H., Esq., 200 Euston Road, N.W. 1.
- 1916 *MYLNE, EVERARD, Esq., B.A., St. Andrew's College, Grahamstown, South Africa.

ELECTED

- 1928 *NAVILLE, MONSIEUR LUCIEN, 5-7 Rue Lévrier, Geneva.
- 1906 NEWBERRY LIBRARY, The Librarian, Chicago, U.S.A.
- 1905 *NEWELL, E. T., Esq., President of the American Numismatic Society, 156th Street, West of Broadway, New York, U.S.A.
- 1904 NEWINGTON PUBLIC LIBRARY, The Librarian, Walworth Road, S.E. 17.
- 1931 NIETER, HANS M., Esq., 41 A Golders Green Road, N.W. 11.
- 1930 NORTHUMBERLAND, THE DUKE OF, 17 Princes Gate, S.W. 7.
- 1882 OMAN, PROFESSOR SIR CHARLES, M.P., K.B.E., M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Frewin Hall, Oxford, *Vice-President*.
- 1925 OMAN, CHARLES CHICHELE, Esq., M.A., Victoria and Albert Museum, S.W. 7.
- 1931 O'NEIL, B. H. St. J., Esq., M.A., F.S.A., 14 Crescent Road, Beckenham, Kent.
- 1932 OSLO, Universitetets Myntkabinet, Norway.
- 1922 PAKENHAM, IVO R. R. L., Esq., St. James's Club, 106 Piccadilly, W. 1.
- 1903 PARSONS, H. ALEXANDER, Esq., 7 Dickinson Road, N. 8.
- 1926 PEARCE, J. W. E., Esq., M.A., F.S.A., 10 Cromwell Place, S.W. 7.
- 1927 PINCHES, JOHN ROBERT, Esq., 21 Albert Embankment, S.E. 11.
- 1928 PIRIE GORDON, H., Esq., D.S.C., M.A., 46 Addison Avenue, W. 11.
- 1927 POND, SHEPARD, Esq., 258 Boylston Street, Boston. Mass., U.S.A.
- 1923 PRAGUE, Bibliothèque de l'Université, Czecho-Slovakia.
- 1890 RAPSON, PROFESSOR E. J., M.A., M.R.A.S., 8 Mortimer Road, Cambridge.
- 1935 RASHLEIGH, J. C. S., Esq., M.A., M.D., Throwleigh, Okehampton, Devon.
- 1923 RAVEL, MONSIEUR O., 7 Bd. de Lorraine, Pointe Rouge, Marseilles.
- 1930 RAWSON, L. H., Esq., Atholl Bank, Lovelace Gardens, Surbiton.
- 1909 RAYMOND, WAYTE, Esq., 465 Park Avenue, New York City, U.S.A.
- 1933 READHEAD, K.R.R., Esq., 157 Woodcote Valley Road, Purley, Surrey.

ELECTED

- 1933 ROBERTS, KENNETH L., Esq., Holy Trinity Vicarage, Bedford.
- 1911 *ROBINSON, E. S. G., Esq., M.A., F.S.A., 23 Upper Phillimore Gardens, W. 8.
- 1910 ROGERS, THE VERY REV. EDGAR, O.B.E., M.A., F.S.A., The Deanery, Bocking, Essex.
- 1924 ROWE, CAPTAIN FRANCIS G. C., The 2nd York and Lancaster Regiment, Sandhurst Barracks, Ahmednagar, India.
- 1919 RYAN, V. J. E., Esq., Les Silleries, Grouville, Jersey, C.I.
- 1916 SAINT LOUIS NUMISMATIC SOCIETY, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., U.S.A.
- 1916 *SALISBURY, F. S., Esq., M.A., Dorset House, Parkland Grove, Ashford, Middlesex.
- 1935 SASSOON, DAVID C., Esq., Trevelyan, Cranley Road, Guildford.
- 1917 SEABY, B. A., Esq., 65 Great Portland Street, W. 1.
- 1907 *SELTMAN, CHARLES T., Esq., M.A., Queens' College, Cambridge.
- 1890 SELTMAN, E. J., Esq., Villa Maria, S. Giorgio a Cremano, Naples.
- 1913 SHIRLEY-FOX, J. S., Esq., R.B.A., 16 Brock Street, Bath.
- 1893 *SIMS, BRIG.-GENERAL R. F. MANLEY-, C.M.G., D.S.O., 163 Strand, W.C. 2.
- 1934 SMITH, WELBORN OWSTON, Esq., M.A., 41 Molyneux Park, Tunbridge Wells.
- 1905 SNELLING, EDWARD, Esq., 8 Amberley Road, E. 10.
- 1930 SNIJDER, PROFESSOR G. A. S., Allard Pierson Stichting, Weesperzijde 33, Amsterdam (O.).
- 1922 SPENCER-CHURCHILL, CAPT. E. G., M.C., F.S.A., Northwick Park, Blockley, Worcestershire.
- 1925 SPINK, MARTIN S., Esq., M.A., 5-7 King Street, S.W. 1.
- 1894 SPINK, SAMUEL M., Esq., 5-7 King Street, S.W. 1.
- 1902 STAINER, CHARLES LEWIS, Esq., Woodhouse, Iffley, Oxford.
- 1928 STEBBING, W. P. D., Esq., F.S.A., Fiveways, Deal.
- 1932 STEWART, JAMES R., Esq., Park Cottage, Kingsdown, Taunton.
- 1931 STRAUSS, M. LOUIS, Cala Ratjada, Capdepera, Mallorca, Spain.
- 1933 SUTHERLAND, ALLAN, Esq., 14 Clifton Terrace, Wellington, New Zealand.
- 1914 SYDENHAM, REV. EDWARD A., M.A., The Vicarage, West Molesey, Surrey.

ELECTED

- 1896 *TAFPS, H. W., Esq., M.B.E., 27 Elderslie Road, Eltham, S.E. 9.
- 1919 TARAPOREVALA, VICAJI D. B., Esq., Tarapore Villa, 79 Koregaon Park, Poona, C. P., India.
- 1917 TAYLOR, GLEN A., Esq., F.S.A., 63 Lewis Road, Neath, Glamorgan.
- 1925 THOMAS, CECIL, Esq., 7 Gloucester Terrace, S.W. 7.
- 1920 THOMAS, J. ROCHELLE, Esq., 18 Ilchester Place, W. 14.
- 1918 THORBURN, PHILIP, Esq., B.A., 6 Callow Street, S.W. 3.
- 1935 TINCHANT, M. PAUL, 19 Avenue des Arts, Brussels.
- 1929 TORONTO, University of, The Librarian, Canada.
- 1894 TRIGGS, A. B., Esq., 33 Macquarie Place, Sydney, New South Wales.
- 1934 ULRICH-BANSA, COLONELE, OSCAR, 9 Riviera S. Nicolò, Venice (Lido), Italy.
- 1912 VAN BUREN, DR. A. W., American Academy, Porta San Pancrazio, Rome (29).
- 1916 VANES, REV. J. A., Morton House, Cheddleton, Leek, Staffs.
- 1899 VLASTO, MICHEL P., Esq., Kerasoundos I, Avenue de la Reine Sophie, Athens (Att.), Greece.
- 1923 WALES, THE NATIONAL MUSEUM OF, Cardiff.
- 1932 WALKER, JOHN, Esq., M.A., M.R.A.S., British Museum, W.C. 1.
- 1924 WALLWORTH, I. N. G., Esq., Fairbanks, Stanley Park Road, Carshalton.
- 1911 WARRE, FELIX W., Esq., O.B.E., M.C., 128 Church Street, W. 8.
- 1920 *WATSON, COMMANDER HAROLD NEWALL, R.N.
- 1901 WEBB, PERCY H., Esq., M.B.E., 4 and 5 West Smithfield, E.C. 1, *Vice-President*.
- 1885 *WEBER, F. PARKES, Esq., M.D., F.S.A., 13 Harley Street, W. 1.
- 1932 WERNSTROM, ERNEST, Esq., P.O. Box 384, San Francisco, U.S.A.
- 1915 WHITEHEAD, R. B., Esq., M.A., M.R.A.S., I.C.S. (ret'd.), 30 Millington Road, Cambridge.
- 1910 WILLIAMS, W. I., Esq., Bryn Deri, Hereford Road, Aber-gavenny.
- 1934 WILTSHIRE, R. G., Esq., Longhouse Lodge, Ermyn Way, Leatherhead.

ELECTED

- 1906 WOOD, HOWLAND, Esq., Curator of the American Numismatic Society, 156th Street, W. of Broadway, New York, U.S.A.
- 1933 WOOD, MISS MARGARET ENVYS, 1 Devonshire Street, W. 1.
- 1920 *WOODWARD, A. M. TRACEY, Esq., Chateau Millefleurs, Cadaujac, Gironde, France.
- 1920 WOODWARD, W. H., Esq., 38 Campden Hill Gate, W. 8.
- 1903 WRIGHT, H. NELSON, Esq., I.C.S. (retd.), The Larches, West Hall Road, Upper Warlingham, Surrey.
- 1933 WÜTHRICH, G., Esq., M.I.E.E., 81 Pursers Cross Road, S.W. 6.
- 1922 YOANNA, A. DE, Esq., B.A., M.D., 111 Pierrepont Street, Brooklyn, New York, U.S.A.
- 1932 YORKSHIRE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY, 10 Park Street, Leeds.
- 1880 YOUNG, ARTHUR W., Esq., 12 Hyde Park Terrace, W. 2.
- 1919 ZIEGLER, PHILIP, Esq., Lilly Villa, Victoria Park, Manchester.

HONORARY FELLOWS

ELECTED

- 1898 HIS MAJESTY VICTOR EMMANUEL III, KING OF ITALY,
Palazzo Quirinale, Rome.
- 1930 ALFÖLDI, PROFESSOR ANDREAS, Ferencz Jozef Rakpart 25,
Budapest.
- 1903 BAHRFELDT, GENERAL DER INFANTERIE A. D., PROFESSOR
MAX VON, Dr.Phil., Zinksgarten-Strasse 2, Halle (Saale),
Germany.
- 1898 BLANCHET, Monsieur ADRIEN, Membre de l'Institut, 10 Bd.
Émile Augier, Paris XVI.
- 1935 CESANO, SIGNORINA L., Museo Nazionale, Rome.
- 1926 DIEUDONNÉ, MONSIEUR A., Conservateur des Médailles,
Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.
- 1899 GABRICI, PROFESSOR DR. ETTORE, Via Formale 30, Naples.
- 1904 KUBITSCHKE, PROFESSOR J. W., Pichlergasse 1, Vienna IX.
- 1932 LAFFRANCHI, SIGNOR L., via Carlo Ravizza 19, Milan.
- 1904 MAURICE, M. JULES, 15 Rue Vaneau, Paris VII.
- 1899 PICK, DR. BEHRENDT, Münzkabinett, Gotha.
- 1932 †REGLING, PROF. DR. KURT, Kaiser Friedrich Museum,
Berlin.
- 1926 TOURNEUR, PROFESSOR VICTOR, Conservateur en chef de la
Bibliothèque Royale, Brussels.

MEDALLISTS

OF THE ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

ELECTED

- 1883 CHARLES ROACH SMITH, Esq., F.S.A.
- 1884 AQUILLA SMITH, Esq., M.D., M.R.I.A.
- 1885 EDWARD THOMAS, Esq., F.R.S.
- 1886 MAJOR-GENERAL ALEXANDER CUNNINGHAM, C.S.I., C.I.E.
- 1887 JOHN EVANS, Esq., D.C.L., LL.D., F.R.S., P.S.A.
- 1888 DR. F. IMHOOF-BLUMER, Winterthur.
- 1889 PROFESSOR PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., F.S.A.
- 1890 MONSIEUR J. P. SIX, Amsterdam.
- 1891 DR. C. LUDWIG MÜLLER, Copenhagen.
- 1892 PROFESSOR R. STUART POOLE, LL.D.
- 1893 M. W. H. WADDINGTON, Sénateur, Membre de l'Institut, Paris.
- 1894 CHARLES FRANCIS KEARY, Esq., M.A., F.S.A.
- 1895 PROFESSOR DR. THEODOR MOMMSEN, Berlin.
- 1896 FREDERIC W. MADDEN, Esq., M.R.A.S.
- 1897 DR. ALFRED VON SALLET, Berlin.
- 1898 THE REV. CANON W. GREENWELL, M.A., F.R.S., F.S.A.
- 1899 M. ERNEST BABELON, Membre de l'Institut, Paris.
- 1900 PROFESSOR STANLEY LANE-POOLE, M.A., Litt.D.
- 1901 S. E. BARON WLADIMIR VON TIESENHAUSEN, St. Petersburg.
- 1902 ARTHUR J. EVANS, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., F.S.A.
- 1903 M. GUSTAVE SCHLUMBERGER, Membre de l'Institut, Paris.
- 1904 HIS MAJESTY VICTOR EMMANUEL III, KING OF ITALY.
- 1905 SIR HERMANN WEBER, M.D.
- 1906 COMM. FRANCESCO GNECCHI, Milan.
- 1907 BARCLAY V. HEAD, Esq., D.Litt., D.C.L., Ph.D., Corr. de l'Inst.
- 1908 PROFESSOR DR. HEINRICH DRESSER, Berlin.
- 1909 HERBERT A. GRUEBER, Esq., F.S.A.
- 1910 DR. FRIEDRICH EDLER VON KENNER, Vienna.
- 1911 OLIVER CODRINGTON, Esq., M.D., M.R.A.S., F.S.A.
- 1912 GENERAL-LEUTNANT MAX VON BAHRFELDT, Hildesheim.
- 1913 GEORGE MACDONALD, Esq., M.A., LL.D.
- 1914 JEAN N. SVORONOS, Athens.
- 1915 GEORGE FRANCIS HILL, Esq., M.A.
- 1916 M. THÉODORE REINACH, Membre de l'Institut, Paris.
- 1917 L. A. LAWRENCE, Esq., F.S.A.
- 1918 Not awarded.
- 1919 M. ADRIEN BLANCHET, Membre de l'Institut, Paris.
- 1920 H. B. EARLE-FOX, Esq., and J. S. SHIRLEY-FOX, Esq.
- 1921 PERCY H. WEBB, Esq.
- 1922 FREDERICK A. WALTERS, Esq., F.S.A.
- 1923 PROFESSOR J. W. KUBITSCHKE, Vienna.
- 1924 HENRY SYMONDS, Esq., F.S.A.
- 1925 EDWARD T. NEWELL, Esq., New York.

ELECTED

- 1926 R. W. MACLACHLAN, Esq., Montreal.
- 1927 M. A. DIEUDONNÉ, Paris.
- 1928 SIR CHARLES OMAN, K.B.E., M.P., D.C.L., F.B.A.
- 1929 MONSIEUR JULES MAURICE, Paris.
- 1930 REV. EDWARD A. SYDENHAM, M.A.
- 1931 MISS HELEN FARQUHAR.
- 1932 H. NELSON WRIGHT, Esq., I.C.S. (retd.).
- 1933 DIREKTOR PROFESSOR KURT REGLING, Berlin.
- 1934 GEORGE CYRIL BROOKE (posthumously).
- 1935 PROFESSOR DR. BEHRENDT PICK, Gotha.

VI.

THE COIN TYPES OF SELINUS AND THE LEGEND OF EMPEDOCLES.

[SEE PLATES III-V.]

(All the illustrations are made from coins in the
Lloyd Collection.)

THE earliest coins of Selinus are those didrachms which, having in relief on one side a leaf of the plant *apium graveolens*, bore on the other an irregularly divided incuse square [Pl. III. 2 and 4]. These were followed by others of the same general character but with the irregular divisions replaced by an incuse square bearing a smaller edition of the leaf which still formed the obverse type [Pl. III. 6 and 8]. There were also litrae or obols and smaller divisions [Pl. III. 12] but no tetradrachms are known of these series, which are regarded as having the year 466 B.C. as their lower limit.¹ They were followed (Head makes no break in date²) by tetradrachms and didrachms of the well-known types shown on Plates IV and V, and these continued fixed, with normal successive developments in style, as the coinage of the city until she was destroyed by Carthage in the year 409 B.C. It is these tetradrachms and didrachms, having a total mintage period of nearly sixty years, which are considered in this communication to the Society, with special regard to their types, whose common interpretation³ it is found necessary first to call into dispute and finally, however reluctantly, entirely to reject.

¹ *H.N.*², p. 167.

² *Ibid.*

³ The author finds no trace of its ever having been questioned.

It is the accepted view of the authorities upon Greek numismatics that the coins of Selinus in question reflect a story of the philosopher Empedocles as told in his life by Diogenes Laertius. Since that story is scarcely ever set forth in its original form by any numismatist it is here transcribed in full, the translation given being that made by R. D. Hicks for the Loeb edition, published in 1925 :

We are told that the people of Selinus suffered from pestilence owing to the noisome smells from the river hard by, so that the citizens themselves perished and their women died in childbirth, that Empedocles conceived the plan of bringing two neighbouring rivers to the place at his own expense, and that by this admixture he sweetened the waters. When in this way the pestilence had been stayed and the Selinuntines were feasting on the river bank, Empedocles appeared ; and the company rose up and worshipped and prayed to him as to a god.

The first person discovered to connect the coins and the story is Hubert Goltzius, whose work was published in Bruges⁴ in 1576. He says :

Empedocles led a channel from the Selinus and Hypsas rivers whereby the waters of both streams rushed into the marsh with great force through a single bed, so diluting the brackish waters of the marsh, which had been sluggish and thick with mud, by a copious flow of fresh water. Thus he delivered the city by his ingenuity and at his own expense from the plague. By which good deed he well deserved that the Selinuntines should yield him divine honours as to the saviour of the citizens and as to a second Aesculapius. For this reason perhaps, on the coins of Selinus showing Empedocles or Hercules Alexicacus making sacrifice, there is engraved a cock and a snake at the altars of Aesculapius.

Here he gives the names of the rivers concerned as the Selinus and the Hypsas (though they are not found,

⁴ *Graecia, sive Historiae Urbium et Populorum Graeciae ex antiquis numismatibus restitutae*, Lib. iv, f. 114 seq.

it is to be observed, in the account of Diogenes)⁵ and tells and interprets the story in substantially the form in which it is presented to-day, with minor variations.

It is not necessary to recite the names and dates of Goltzius's earlier successors in the same and two following centuries; they repeat him in essence, and a similar connexion of the coins and the legend is taught to-day by those modern writers whom we hold in reverence, such as Curtius, Holm, Head, Sir George Macdonald, and Sir George Hill. The current modern version must be given, and that written by the present Director of the British Museum in his *Coins of Ancient Sicily* is the most detailed and eloquent. He says:

There can be little doubt but that these coins allude to the deliverance of the city from a pestilence caused by the stagnation of the waters of the river. The people died, and the women suffered grievously in childbirth. Empedocles, the celebrated philosopher, was consulted, and by a feat of engineering, which seems to have consisted in connecting the channels of two rivers, and thus obtaining a stronger current, swept away the cause of the malaria. The tetradrachms with which we have to do show on the obverse the deities Apollo and Artemis proceeding slowly in their chariot, Artemis driving, while her brother the sun-god discharges arrows from his bow. The arrows are the healing rays of the sun, which drive away the malarial mists; and Artemis is beside him as the goddess who eases the pains of women labouring with child.

On the reverse is the river-god Selinus himself, a youthful figure, with small horns on his head, sacrificing with a libation-bowl over an altar. The altar is sacred to Asklepios, the god of healing, for a cock, his sacred bird,

⁵ It is reasonable to suppose that the original story would name the rivers concerned, and that their omission in its survival is due to the subsequent deterioration of the account.

stands before it. In his left hand the river-god holds a branch, used for sprinkling lustral water in the ceremony of purification. Behind him stands the figure of a bull on a pedestal, and above that is a selinon leaf. It is difficult to explain the bull. It may be that it "symbolizes the sacrifice which was offered on the occasion" of the cleansing. Or is it, as the pedestal seems to suggest, some monument, erected at the time as an offering in expiation of the summary method which Empedocles had adopted with the cause of the pestilence? To the Greeks, there must have been behind that pestilence some supernatural power, who would be offended by the philosopher's interference with him. And what do we find on the other Selinuntine coins before us? On the obverse, the struggle between health and strength on the one hand, and the power of the stagnant water and its effluvia on the other, is symbolized by the battle between Heracles and the *Bull*. On the reverse, another river-god, this time the Hypsas, is represented sacrificing, with libation-bowl and lustral branch, to a god around whose altar a serpent twines. This altar is probably once more an altar of Asklepios. Behind Hypsas the place of the bull is taken by a marsh-bird, which seems to stalk away in high disgust at the disappearance of its favourite haunts. The selinon-leaf fills the rest of the field. These two coins thus complement each other, and in their curious fullness of detail form a most illuminating commentary on the dry statement of the ancient biographer of Empedocles.

We may presume that still represents the views of Sir George Hill upon this matter as seen by his repetition of them in the *Illustrated London News* of 27 December 1924.

But, with that openness of mind characteristic of him, he added in that article of ten years ago:

The interpretation of the designs on ancient coins often leads us into treacherous places, and the danger of giving too free play to symbolical explanations is obvious to any one who has been properly trained in the subject. It is possible that the story which is generally accepted in explanation of the coins which are illustrated here would not come unscathed out of a searching criticism.

Until eleven years ago the author had given no critical consideration to the accepted story, but, in 1924, an important addition of Selinuntine coins was made to the Lloyd Collection, during the study of which he came to realize that there were serious topographical obstacles to be overcome by Empedocles in carrying out the enterprise attributed to him. The task was so great that, although 2,400 years have passed since the work was said to have been done, there should still be found ineradicable traces of the undertaking in the city itself and upon its countryside; in a visit to Selinus three or four years before, the writer had seen the site and its surroundings fairly thoroughly, but could remember no feature of the city or its district which bore any indication of work of the magnitude implied by the story.

Investigation led to the conclusion that few writers on the subject can have visited the city, still less its district, of which these things were told. Even Freeman, despite his personal knowledge of Sicily, apparently believed the acropolis to have the two rivers, Selinus and Hypsas, close upon either side.⁶ The actual fact is that the Hypsas lies some miles to the east of the Selinus with an elevated country between, and any observant person walking or driving from the one river to the other cannot fail to be impressed by the stupendous character of the task which would be involved in causing the waters of the Hypsas to flow into the bed of the smaller stream; if that connexion had been made its deep channel would show its course to this day, as it would for ages yet to come. Moreover,

⁶ Freeman, *Sicily*, iii, 461.

the removal of the Hypsas water over such a course would have produced, at the seaward end of the Hypsas estuary, the very conditions it was sought to remove at Selinus. These obstacles to the acceptance of the story as interpreted were found to be fully recognized by the excavators of Selinus, Gabrici and his assistants; they were compelled to confine the exploit to a mere connexion of runnels on the eastern side of the acropolis. Fougères also, writing in 1910,⁷ declared that for topographical reasons the joining of the two rivers was impossible, and he too fell back upon the harnessing of springs and streamlets as his solution of the problem. A work on so small a scale seems to be out of keeping with the story told by Diogenes Laertius, as also with its application to the coin types by Goltzius and his successors down to the present day.

The inability to discover any present visible trace of the tremendous work attributed to Empedocles was in itself sufficiently serious, but that did not exhaust the difficulties: there were questions of date, and of the relation in which the philosopher stood to Selinus, also calling aloud for consideration.

According to Head, these types first appeared upon the expulsion of the tyrants in 466; and even those who regard the transitional coinage of Sicily generally as beginning at a slightly later date than did Head would not put them much after 462. The birth of Empedocles is attributed to about 494; his grandfather won an Olympic victory in 496. The philosopher's *floruit* is given as about 444, and his death placed at about 430; it would seem, therefore, that if the coin

⁷ Hulot et Fougères, *Selinonte*, p. 105.

types refer to the work said to have been done by Empedocles at Selinus, the undertaking must have been carried out by him when a very young man, probably when in his twenties. Important as the question of date is seen to be, it is often ignored, as witness Fougères, who places the Empedoclean work at Selinus in 444⁸ while still connecting it with the coin types of twenty years earlier.⁹ The expense involved by the work must have been prodigious, and it is difficult to believe that a private citizen could have taken this burden upon himself, especially at so early an age.

Further, this great task and expenditure attributed to Empedocles were not undertaken by him at his own door, for his own people, but for a community of great wealth, lying nearly seventy miles away from his own city, with which, indeed, it was constantly at enmity and frequently engaged in warfare.

These difficulties presented an insurmountable obstacle to continued belief in the legend and led to a determined effort to find some more credible interpretation. Amongst other means adopted was the traversing of the whole length of the Selinuntine coast-line from the river Mazarus in the west to the river Halykus and the site of Heraclea Minoa in the east, a journey which had not been undertaken, to the best available information, by any archaeologist within living memory. The veteran superintendent of Sicilian antiquities and sites, Senator Orsi, admitted that he himself had never visited Heraclea Minoa.

It will be useful to set out briefly the outlines of the ancient state of Selinus. Space that would be occupied

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 103.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

by discussion of all the references and arguments upon which this topographical account is based, may be saved by saying that those interested will find further details in a communication entitled "Selinus and Heraclea Minoa: Questions of Nomenclature and Chronology" which the author read before the Cambridge Philological Society and which was published in their *Proceedings* for 1928.

The circuit may be begun from the state's eastern frontier, at the point where was situated that ancient dependent town of Selinus known as Heraclea Minoa. The right bank of the river Halykus is flanked by a lofty headland whose precipitous limestone cliffs to the south and east have procured for it the modern name Capo Bianco. On the landward side the headland rises steeply from the low-lying plain on the westward side of the river, save in one place towards the east, where a narrow ridge was defended by works of which a rectangular building and a round tower remain. A hollow, looking south-west, might well be the cavea of a theatre, but nothing else was found above ground at Heraclea Minoa.

From this strategic point as against attack from Akragas, the state extended along the coast through the modern Sciacca (the ancient Selinuntine baths), past the river Hypsas and its estuary, through Selinus river and city to the great quarries of Rocche di Cusa whence came the stone for the temples, as witness the great drums lying stranded on the road, in the fields, and standing upright, part-hewn in various stages, in the rocks themselves. Hence it stretched over no great distance to the Mazarus river and port which it included. Hence it ran northward near Haliciae, then

proceeded eastward until it met the valley of the Halykus again. An area so defined would give Selinus a roughly drawn rectangle of about 42 miles east and west, and about 16 miles north and south.

This large area was traversed in most directions by the author, special attention being given to the seaward districts, which were examined several times. The country north-east of the city and of the modern Castelvetro were also searched carefully on the chance of finding in that region any evidence of a cutting leading from the upper courses of the Hypsas in the direction of Selinus, that might tend to confirm the Empedoclean story.

Beyond the boundaries described were the important cities of Segesta, Himera, and Akragas. Segesta and Selinus were the cause of frequent pinpricks to each other by reason of their riparian and other rivalries; Akragas was a serious menace to Selinus as to most other Sicilian Greeks, of which more later. With the citizens of Himera, however, the relations of Selinus were friendly and even intimate. They were the westernmost Hellenes of northern Sicily, as were the Selinuntines of southern, and the conditions and history of the two states had much in common. Each had passed so far to the west that all Greek states were behind it, each found on its western frontier non-Hellenic peoples who presented similar problems of development and defence. The southern boundary of the one, the northern boundary of the other, lay not far apart and, at the period of their settlement in the sixth century, were separated only by weak units of native races who were not likely seriously to interfere with the intercourse of the two Greek cities.

History presents us with few notices of the details of the intercourse between Himera and Selinus, but it is significant that those we do possess speak of common trouble, alliance for defence, and of ultimate simultaneous overthrow by a powerful barbarian enemy. Akragas, on the other hand, was never a comfortable neighbour to the other Greek cities of Sicily, especially to Himera and Selinus. The earliest accounts we have of her bring into prominence her tyrant, Phalaris, who ruled her from about 570 to 554; his cruelty was unparalleled and the story of the brazen bull, in which he roasted his victims alive must, says a recent authority, be accepted as a literal fact.¹⁰ That story remained a tradition associated with his city, and the policy of that state for 150 years thereafter was of a nature to keep it alive.

It is the battle of Himera in 480 which provides the first recorded contact of any importance between the two states, Himera and Selinus. Most of Hellenic Sicily was ranged against Carthage, but Himera and Selinus were aligned with the barbarian foe. Himera was menaced by Akragas and, in her trouble, was thrown into the arms of Carthage; Selinus, too, found Akragas a steady enemy and, though her own case against that city was not at the moment urgent, her altruism and self-interest alike led her to come to the aid of Himera in her defiance of Akragas. Seventy years later Selinus and Himera were overwhelmed together by Carthage in 409, so that their fortunes are seen to be linked when Carthage was friendly and also when her aim and achievement led to their utter overthrow and desolation.

¹⁰ *Cambridge Ancient History*, iv, 355.

It is not a little remarkable that the coins of the two cities have resemblances which do much to support the evidence of intimate intercourse, thus supplementing, as they also precede, the scanty historical notices we possess. The earliest coin-weights of the two cities are different, but that has no significance as bearing upon this matter of resemblance; it reflects only the separate sources from which the two cities sprang. The general nearness in character of the coinage of both begins with their earliest issues and is clearly seen on the plates; Plate III shows in numbers 1 and 3 coins of Himera, in nos. 2 and 4 coins of Selinus. There is the badge of each city shown on its coin on the one side with an incuse design on the other; each has its own city's peculiar type, but the technique and general scheme are the same, giving a similarity not easily matched elsewhere in Sicily at that time.

Then there comes a change. In nos. 5 and 7, and in nos. 6, 8, and 12, both cities have shed their incuse design and have adopted instead subsidiary types which in both cases have close relationship to the major badge-types.

Himera displays an occasional freakishness, as the rare coin on Pl. III. 9 shows. A later example of this habit will be alluded to below. So also at Selinus are seen examples not followed, apparently, by Himera, in the obols, litrae, and hemi-litrae with types on each side [Pl. III. 12].

Then at Himera we find a definite departure made under *force majeure*. During her subjection for years to Akragas and her tyrants she was forced to give monetary expression to that fact by bearing the crab of Akragas to share the sovereignty with her own cock

[Pl. III. 10]. Selinus went through no such period of subjection to Akragas, though she fell under the yoke of her local tyrants; her coin types, therefore, suffered no like change.

At about this same period the Sicilian cities generally were labouring under such domination of tyranny, but Himera secured her freedom in 472, Selinus about 466, and it is marked at Himera by that other example of Himeraean freakishness to which reference has been made, in the very small series of which Pl. III. 11 shows one,¹¹ but shortly thereafter she came into the same general community of character with Selinus as exhibited in the coins seen on Pl. IV. Here again we continue with Himera in nos. 13, 15, 17, 19, Selinus in nos. 14, 16, 18, 20, where we have for each city a chariot on the obverse, and on the reverse a figure sacrificing at an altar; there are naturally differences in detail. Though the examples might be multiplied, the coins shown on the plates will serve to substantiate the claim that our knowledge of the friendship of the two cities as derived from historical notices is supported by the generally similar character of their coinage.

Up to this point there have been discussed (*a*) the general obstacles encountered in seeking a fit home for the Empedoclean legend at Selinus, and (*b*) very briefly, the physical and historical setting of the city.

We may now proceed to consider the difficulties presented by the prevailing interpretation of the

¹¹ There are four known in all, two in the Berlin Museum, one in the British Museum, and the one shown from the Lloyd Collection.

Selinuntine coin types themselves, beginning with the tetradrachm. Of the obverse there is little need to speak. Selinus is emphatically a city of Apollo; her vast temple on her eastern hill was dedicated to his worship and it was natural that she should proclaim her devotion by placing upon her principal coin, a well-known representation of her tutelary deity and his divine sister. The same or a similar representation is found on the frieze of the temple of Bassae forty years later in date.

For the reverse design there is agreement, probably, that the sacrificing figure is, as the legend proclaims, the river-god Selinus, who typifies both river and city; that is, the city is seen making sacrifice, presumably to Apollo. The lustral branch calls for no comment and the selinon leaf, the badge of the city, is found upon every coin of the city from first to last, of every denomination, and in both metals (there is no gold). It is when we come to the cock that our difficulties begin. The current interpretation is "The altar is sacred to Asklepios, the God of Healing, for a cock, his sacred bird, stands before it."¹² This statement, that the cock is essentially the sacred bird of Asklepios, one might expect to be derived from abundant literary evidence, but the actual position is that it is based only upon one brief passage in the *Phaedo*. When Socrates was dying he exclaimed, "We owe a cock to Asklepios; see that it is paid." That is all! There is nothing in those words which establishes the claim that the cock is the specially appropriate sacrifice to Asklepios, and indeed they lend themselves to

¹² Hill, *Coins of Ancient Sicily*, p. 84.

a different and quite natural interpretation. Socrates was a poor man; bulls, pigs, and goats were not for him, his purse would not extend to them. A cock, however, he could afford, or ask his friends to afford for him, and a cock he had promised to Asklepios as he would promise it to any other gods he sought to honour or to appease. The recognition that a poor man's gifts to his divinity may have to be on a lower scale than a rich man's is very old. In Leviticus v. 6 *seqq.* we read, "He shall bring . . . unto the Lord . . . a lamb or a kid. . . . And if he be not able to bring a lamb then he shall bring . . . two turtle doves or two young pigeons. . . . And if he be not able to bring two turtle doves or two young pigeons . . . he shall bring for his offering the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour." The author's own view upon the matter is supported by Hastings, *Dictionary of Religion*, by Dr. Rouse in his *Votive Offerings*, and by others. In a passage also most apropos to our purpose Roscher says (translated), "The cock on the well-known Selinuntine coins is not an allusion to Asklepios; this bird equally belongs to Hermes, Mars, Helios, Kore, Hero-cults", &c.

It is not proposed to suggest some other divinity than Asklepios as being indicated by the cock; these opinions of others are offered in support of the belief that it is far from being necessary to follow the sixteenth-century Goltzius in his discovery that we are to find Asklepios pointed to upon these Selinuntine coins. An entirely different interpretation of the cock and, of necessity, of the altar, will be offered.

Let us turn to the bull. Sir George Hill says:

It is difficult to explain the bull. It may be that it "symbolizes the sacrifice which was offered on the occa-

sion" of the cleansing. Or is it, as the pedestal seems to suggest, some monument, erected at the time as an offering in expiation of the summary method which Empedocles had adopted with the cause of the pestilence?

The suggestion of a monument is forced upon us by the general form. The bull stands upon a pedestal which, again, rests upon a base. But the proposal that it has reference to a monument erected at the time is not easy to accept; such a monument the die engravers or artists would have under their eye, and we should expect a constant rendering of the same detail. That is not what we do find; the bull is rendered differently from die to die and even more so is his pedestal. That is also the case with the altar, and we are driven to conclude that it is not any particular altar, not any existing bull monument at Selinus that are here portrayed. The coins illustrated (Pl. IV. 14, 16, 18, 20-24) show so clearly the variation in form given to bull, pedestal, and altar, as to make superfluous any detailed particularization in words.

This statement of some of the difficulties inherent in the current interpretation of the tetradrachm type leaves the course clear for the presentation of an alternative explanation.

On the obverse we have the assertion in legend and in type that this is the coin of the Selinuntine people, the people by whom Apollo is worshipped.

On the reverse we see the city symbolized in the young horned river-god sacrificing at the altar of that great divinity Apollo to whose worship the city is devoted and to whom it looks for aid. That aid is sought in this instance on behalf of the city's neighbour and ally, Himera, who is represented in her

badge-form of a cock¹³ as standing in front of the altar by which she may be said to be protected. On the right, on a pedestal, is the representation of Akragas, against whose attacks Himera has appealed, as we know she did, for aid to Selinus and she, in turn, to her god. Akragas is appropriately rendered by the brazen bull of Phalaris, whose grim story was kept alive in Sicilian hearts by the aggressive deeds of his successors.

A monument which stood in the agora of Akragas nearly seventy miles away was not likely to be realistically rendered at Selinus, and so we have a complete explanation of that variation in its details to which attention has been drawn. Selinus is thus seen to have reproduced on her tetradrachms, her major coins, a story of which she was proud, perpetuating the memory of her friendship for Himera, of the sacrifice she had made on her behalf, and, not least, setting forth the honour in which she held her great divinity.

Long after this interpretation had suggested itself as the reasonable meaning of the tetradrachm types, the author found striking confirmation in one reverse die (Pl. V. 27) which stands apart in two respects from all others of the mint. In this die, throwing aside all previous restraint, the engraver tells his countrymen and any others interested that the bull does in very truth stand for Akragas by putting on its pedestal an heroic size A, a letter differing here in scale and in mode of presentation from that of any other coin of

¹³ Cf. the cock of the Selinuntine coin (Pl. V. 25), and that of the Himeraean (Pl. V. 26).

any mint. And, to match this unmasking of the bull, the cock also undergoes a transformation. In every die throughout the series (cf. Pl. IV. 14, 16, 18, 20-24) he is found facing towards the left, but in this he is swung round to the right and, brought into full view of his ancient enemy thus plainly proclaimed, he pours out his hatred from the protecting altar of Selinus by screaming defiance at the bull through his wide-open beak.

Passing to the didrachms we have here also on the obverse a declaration in legend that this is a coin of the Selinuntine people, and a type which asserts that the territory of Selinus extends even to the town of Heraclea Minoa, 42 miles distant from the city of Selinus itself. For we must see in this design of Heracles subduing the Minoan bull a canting reference to the town whose name, first Minoa, became Heraclea Minoa with reference to the Heracleids who settled there about 510.¹⁴ This type is the subject of one of those great sixth-century metopes found at Selinus over one hundred years ago, which form the outstanding glory of the National Museum at Palermo to-day.

On the reverse we have again a sacrificing horned river-god. The story of the friendship for Himera is not continued on the didrachm because it was complete on the tetradrachm. The river-god on this denomination is the Hypsas (named by the legend), that river which some have supposed to be one whose flow was joined by Empedocles to that of the Selinus. The god sacrifices at an altar entwined by a serpent, with

¹⁴ Cf. the communication to the Cambridge Philological Society referred to *supra*, p. 80.

reference perhaps to an underworld divinity; possibly one connected with the celebrated mineral springs called *Thermae Selinuntinae*, whose therapeutic properties are still perpetuated in the modern baths of Sciacca, and perhaps the one shown upon the litra in company with the nymph *Eurymedusa* (Pl. V. 36, 37). In this we might see another territorial reference, making four in all on the two denominations.

But there is yet a further symbol, another of the many in which the coinage abounds; this is the bird in the bottom right-hand corner. In the British Museum Catalogue of 1876 it is styled a crane, but it is the modern practice to refer to it more generally as a marsh bird. Ornithological friends consulted are positive that it is not a crane, but some variety of heron—not the English common heron but either the purple heron or the little egret, the *Ardea Purpurea*, or *Ardea Garzetta* of Linnaeus, both of which are found nesting freely on the shores of the Mediterranean. There is much detail and variation in the rendering of the bird in the nine dies which are found in the Lloyd Collection [cf. Pl. V. 28–35], variation due possibly to observation of the heron in different stages of growth and season. One feature is common to them all, and that the most striking: the bird is in motion, with a stilted stride which, if it were other than natural, might be indicative of disdain. But such a lifting of the legs is essential to the progress of a large bird in marsh lands and the egret had, in consequence, earned for itself the reputation of conceit.¹⁵ This is well

¹⁵ Cf. Dionysios, *Ὀρνιθιακά* 2. 8 ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ τέχνῃ (sc. fishing) μεγαλαυχήσαντας καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸν εἰπόντας ὑπὲρ νήξεως ἐρίξειν δύνασθαι σφισι τὸν Ποσειδῶνα.

described in many Greek words of which the stem is ψ - with the sense of large, high, yielding such words as $\psi\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\nu$ carrying the neck high, $\psi\iota\beta\acute{\alpha}\mu\omega\nu$ high-treading, and other similar compounds. Whether the reference is to the physical characteristics and habit of the bird, or is rather to be viewed as pointing indirectly to its accepted reputation, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that we have in this symbol a reference to Hypsas, the name of the river-god above, yielding another canting badge to add to the Selinuntine series.

In this communication it has been found necessary to reject the current interpretation of the coin types; the argument and conclusions have gone farther and have shown reason for denying the truth of the story of the engineering enterprise as referred to Selinus. The author does not believe, however, that the work attributed to Empedocles need be rejected in itself, and it is possible to suggest a site where its story may be read with complete satisfaction.

That stories connected with a famous name shift their local habitations with ease is too much of a commonplace for elaboration; we need only recall to memory the stories of that nature associated with the names of Alexander the Great, of Theodoric, and of Charlemagne, to establish the truism.

Empedocles lived between *circa* 494 and 430 B.C. We cannot say through what or how many lips and hands the varied story of his life passed, but it has survived only in the form written by a man of whose date all that can be said is that he lived probably in the second century after Christ, thus yielding a margin of about 550 years between the dates of the philosopher

and his biographer. Bearing in our minds the world-long, world-wide peripatetic tendency of the stories of famous men, it does not seem extravagant to suggest that the story of Empedocles we have been considering was originally linked up with his life and doings in his native city of Akragas; that, in the course of oft retelling during the more than 500 years which passed before it reached our only surviving authority, it had been transferred to the city of Selinus.

In Akragas there is no geographical obstacle to the acceptance of the story. The city has small rivers on either side, they enter the sea at no great distance from the city by a common mouth, over a stretch of land of a character which might well, lacking sufficient flow of purifying water, become such a plague area as is described in the story.¹⁶ Indeed, when the author first made the acquaintance of this area many years ago, it displayed warning notices of the dread diseases which even then assailed it. It is not unlikely that in the fifth century before Christ these two streams found their way to the sea by channels separate from each other; the union of their flows would be a comparatively simple matter as an engineering operation, it

¹⁶ Cf. the plan of ancient Akragas in Bury's *History of Greece*, p. 636, and Freeman's *History of Sicily*, iii. app. p. 520. It is of some interest to remark that one of the Akragantine rivers also bore the name Hypsas, which need create no surprise when it is remembered how in Great Britain the same name is applied to different streams, often distant from each other, as in our Avon, Dee, Ouse, and Wye. The river Hypsas at Akragas is small, while the Hypsas of Selinus is one of the large streams of Sicily; if, as suggested above (n. 5, p. 75), the story, when first told, supplied the names of the rivers concerned, it may be that the greater fame and size of the Selinuntine Hypsas was responsible for the transference of the scene at a later date from Akragas to Selinus.

would place no insuperable burden upon the resources of a wealthy man, and would not necessarily leave any surviving obvious traces.

Empedocles was an Akragantine citizen, a scion of a house of ancient lineage and of wealth, who laboured for the political freedom of his fellow citizens and was zealous in his support of the poor.

Told of Akragas, the story presents no difficulty, chronological, physical, economic, personal; it is commended to the consideration of students as applied to those surroundings.

A. H. LLOYD.

VII.

ANTIOCH OR VIMINACIUM?

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF GORDIAN III AND PHILIP I.

[SEE PLATES VI-VII.]

AN important factor in the essential rearrangement of the coinage of the Empire is the determination of the pieces struck outside of Rome, i.e. the question of mints. For the Greek provincial coinage, in addition to the British Museum *Catalogue*, the Berlin *Corpus* (particularly Dacia and Viminacium), and the *Recueil général* of the Paris Academy, we have already several good monographs in the works of Vogt (Alexandria), Wruck (Syria), and Sydenham (Caesarea Cappadociae). Clemens Bosch has done important work in shorter articles, particularly on the chronology.¹ For the Roman coinage the Vienna school, especially Voetter, has done brilliant preparatory work for the third to the fifth century. For the first century Mattingly has done admirable work in the British Museum *Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Empire*. His arrangement of the issues of the Civil War and of the year of the Four Emperors, for example, is a brilliant achievement.

It is clear, however, that the difficult question of the arrangement of the coins without mint-mark—only from about 293-294 did Diocletian order mints

¹ *Numismatik*, 1933, Parts 3-6; *Die kleinasiatischen Münzen der römischen Kaiserzeit*, ii, 1, *Bithynien* (Stuttgart, 1935).

to be marked²—conceals many problems and affords many opportunities for error. Only gradually does one gain a clearness of view and confidence in decision.

Why were coins struck on the Roman model outside of the city? I answered this question in the principles of method which I laid down in the *Vienna Num. Z.*, 1933, p. 17, as follows:

The reasons for coinage in a provincial city vary at different times. Augustus strikes precious metals in Gaul, Spain, and in the East to keep up the legal fiction that as Imperator he can strike gold and silver in the provinces. Tiberius naturally follows him. In the period of revolution after Nero, it is now military considerations combined with those of prestige. For the third century the only reason left is the necessities of warfare. It is remarkable, however, that the legal fiction of the exclusive coinage of the precious metals still persists, but, it is true, it is now supported by practical considerations.

These guiding principles have justified themselves amply in the period from Pescennius Niger to Pupienus inclusive, which I have already worked through. But for Gordian III and Philip I they seemed no longer to hold. The following investigation, an important contribution to the question of the organization of the mints, will now show that in this very period the transition from the occasional issue of coins in provincial cities for military purposes to the institution of permanent imperial mints outside Rome by Diocletian is taking place; of course still hesitatingly, with occasional stoppages and interruptions just as we have the reverse process, the local issues of the individual "Greek" mints, which attained under Gordian III their apparent culminating point (but really the turning-point) already declining under Philip I, still

² Pink, *Num. Z.*, 1930, p. 38.

more under Valerian and Gallienus, and becoming practically extinct under Claudius II. Diocletian closed the last mint, the highly privileged mint of Alexandria.

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND.

The paucity of sources for our period is well known. Rohden has given them in his article on Gordian in *R.E.*, "Antoninus", no. 60,³ which is still of fundamental importance.

Soon after the accession of Gordian III, which may be placed with certainty in the summer of 238, Menophilus was appointed governor in Moesia Inferior in order to avert the most imminent danger, against which Maximinus had already begun preparations, the invasions by the Goths. The elevation of Viminacium to a colony and the beginning of a provincial coinage⁴ are probably connected with this. This beginning is put in October 239.⁵ This coinage, like that of Alexandria, of the Syrian Antioch, of Caesarea in Cappadocia, and later of Dacia, was intended for the whole province.

But a much greater danger threatened. While the struggle with the enemy in the east, the Persians, had long been a matter of great anxiety to the Roman emperors, it now became a much greater one after the great national revolution which had taken place in

³ *R.E.* = Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*; cf. also Costa, *Diz. Epigr.*, s. v. Gordianus Nepos.

⁴ Cf. Pick, *Die antiken Münzen von Dacien und Moesien*, 1898, pp. 21 ff.

⁵ Elmer, in an article which appears in *Numismatičar* (Belgrade), 1935, p. 22, puts the beginning of the era in July 239, which is more satisfactory.

228 in Persia under Ardashir I. Unfortunately Tabari's *Chronicle* leaves us in the lurch here, since, as its brilliant editor Nöldeke points out,⁶ it is deliberately silent about anything that might diminish the glory of the Sassanians. Although Severus Alexander succeeded in conquering the Persians and forcing them to peace, the passion for conquest soon flamed up again in the breast of the new and powerful ruler, and before the end of the reign of Maximinus he had taken Carrhae and Nisibis. It was therefore obvious that Rome would prepare for a new campaign, particularly as the friend and councillor of the young ruler, the Praefectus Praetorio C. Furius Sabinus Aquila Timesitheus,⁷ later his father-in-law, was Procurator of the province of Syria at the time of Severus Alexander's campaign,⁸ and therefore as "exactor reliqu. annon. sacrae expeditionis"⁹ was well acquainted with the conditions, especially the monetary ones. With this I would now connect the remarkable fact that a coinage of antoniniani¹⁰ appears at Antioch from at least the beginning of 239, which is discussed in our second section; but it stops about 241. In this year Sapor I, son of Ardashir I, ascended the throne.¹¹ He at once declared war. Antioch fell. Mommsen, following Tillemont's¹² opinion, declared himself against this

⁶ *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden. Aus der arabischen Chronik des Tabari*, Leiden, 1879.

⁷ A. Stein, in *R.E.*, "Furius", no. 89.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, col. 365.

⁹ *Prosop. Imp. Rom.*, "Furius", p. 101.

¹⁰ Voetter, *Num. Z.*, 1894, pp. 407 ff.

¹¹ Cf. *R.E.*, "Sapor I".

¹² *Röm. Gesch.* v, p. 421; also Tillemont, *Hist. d. Emp.* iii, p. 254.

assumption, and Rohden agreed with him. But both Costa and Stein follow what to me are the quite unmistakable words of the *Vita* (ed. Hohl). For what can chap. 27, 5, *Persas . . . ab Antiochensium cervicibus, quas iam nexas Persico ferro gerebant, et reges Persarum et leges amovimus . . .* mean except that the town was occupied by the enemy? For a mere siege both *nexas ferro* and *leges* are too strong. Chap. 26, 5 has the same story: (*Antiochia*) *quae a Persis iam tenebatur*, and 6, *Antiochiam recepit*. The numismatic material is in agreement with this.¹³

In the spring of 242 Gordian set out with a large army. He took the land route through Moesia as the Carpi there had recently been troublesome after the recall of Menophilus. Besides, the Emperor wished to strengthen his army by the addition of the Danube legions. And in fact Legio V Mac. usually stationed in Dacia appears along with VIII Aug. on provincial issues of Heliopolis under Philip (Cohen 333, for Philip II, 130-131). Perhaps we may also quote here the tombstone of a *miles* of Legio VIII Aug. from Cyrrhus (*C. I. L.* iii, 193). From the same town comes a tombstone of the third century which mentions Legio IIII Flavia (*C. I. L.* iii, 195), which with VII Claudia¹⁴ formed the garrison of Viminacium, and perhaps also was partly mobilized. The IIII Flavia, moreover, put up a tombstone to Gordian III (*C. I. L.* iii, 8154). There is also in Cyrrhus a tombstone of a legionary of VII Gem. (Philippiana, *C. I. L.* iii, 194),

¹³ Cp. on the whole question also Sykes, *History of Persia*, i, p. 431.

¹⁴ Also named Philippiana, cf. Ritterling in *R.E.*, "Legio", col. 1629.

so that this legion was also represented by a detachment in the Persian war. There was clearly an action of some magnitude at Cyrrhus. Legio II Parthica was also in the army. It was attached to the emperor as a kind of Praetorian guard. This is why precisely for the reign of Gordian we have no epitaphs from the Alban Mount, while the veterans erected a monument dedicated to Victoria Redux to the emperor Philip on his return (*C. I. L.* vi, 793).¹⁵ The participation of Legio III Parth. is known from its permanent camp in Rhesaina where the battle was fought. It appears also on the coins of this town as Leg. III P. especially under Trajan Decius.¹⁶ Ritterling (*R.E.*, *loc. cit.*) further quotes I Adjutrix (*I. G. R.* iii, 1412; *C. I. L.* iii, 196, 6706?), III Pia Fidelis, and XIII Gemina. He also thinks he can deduce from *C. I. L.* xi, 1836, that detachments of the X Gem. and XIII Gem. were also in the field.¹⁷ Finally in col. 1593 he quotes a coin of Otacilia of Damascus (Cohen 102) with Leg. VI F., i.e. Ferrata. This is perhaps to be explained like the coins of Leg. V Mac. and VIII Aug. from this campaign. That II Adjutrix also took part in the campaign is evident from the fact that it afterwards erected a monument to the emperor (*C. I. L.* iii, 14, 534⁶), and bears the honorary name of Philipiana.

Gordian then crossed the Bosphorus after minor and not always successful fighting, and certainly marched by the great military road which ran from Nicomedia via Nicaea, Iuliopolis, Ancyra, Tyana, and Tarsus to

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, cols. 1478 ff.

¹⁶ *Brit. Mus. Cat.*, Mesopotamia, p. 126.

¹⁷ *R.E.*, "Legio", col. 1742.

Antioch.¹⁸ Antioch was first of all recaptured. Coinage was at once begun as is shown below on the provincial standard and in antoniniani. But the issues with **VICTORIA DOMINI** mentioned by Costa l. c. were struck in the *Pisidian* Antioch. After successful fighting, which included the recapture of Carrhae and the great decisive battle of Rhesaina, as a result of which Nisibis was relieved, the emperor wished to go along the Chaboras and Euphrates to Ctesiphon (in 243). Then came the catastrophe of February 244; the young emperor fell a victim to the plots of his praetorian prefect Philip—Timesitheus had died in the preceding year. This took place below Circesium, where Philip put up a monument to him.

The vital matter for the new emperor was to be recognized by the Senate. He therefore hastened to make peace with the Persians.¹⁹ Zonaras²⁰ records that the Romans were not pleased at the conclusion of peace. This seems to be true. The emperor assumed the title of Parthicus Maximus, but only used it for a short time, probably until he reached home. In inscriptions it is found on the stone of Legio II Adj. (*C. I. L.* iii, 10, 619) and on the milestones (*C. I. L.* iii, 4, 634, and 14, 354⁶). The title Persicus Maximus²¹ is found in the inscription *C. I. L.* vi, 1097. This inscription has the first Trib. Pot. and therefore be-

¹⁸ Itiner. Hier. and Anton; also Costa 549.

¹⁹ The sources in Schulz, *Vom Prinzipat zum Dominat*, p. 33.

²⁰ xii, 19, ed. Dindorf.

²¹ So far as I know, hitherto unusual, later only borne by Carus—a medallion of Probus with "Exercitus Pers." in O. Strada, p. 159, and wrongly copied from him in Vaillant, p. 217 and all later writers, including Cohen and Gnechi.

longs to the year 244.²² Henzen²³ has already pointed out that the title is to be placed in the beginning of Philip's reign, and that he later dropped it. Pick says the same for the issues of Viminacium (p. 38). The statement in the *Vita Gordiani* 33, 3 is quite in keeping with this: *Has autem omnes feras . . . parabat ad triumphum Persicum, quod votum publicum nihil valuit. Nam omnia haec Philippus exhibuit saecularibus ludis. . .* Nothing is said about a Persian triumph. The best evidence, however, is given by the coins which are dealt with below. The emperor calls himself **P M** = Parthicus Maximus²⁴ on coins of Antioch in Syria, Antioch in Pisidia, and Viminacium. This then is his route, which I shall deal with fully below. The emperor reached home before July 23, as Stein concludes from *C. I. L.* vi, 793.²⁵

²² The inscriptions, which have **COS** and therefore belong to 245, from Aquincum, mechanically continued this title in ignorance of the events that had meanwhile happened. Such errors are frequently found in the provinces.

²³ In Dessau, *Inscr. Sel.*, note to 506.

²⁴ That **P M** here cannot mean Pontifex Maximus is evident—apart from all evidence quoted later: from the simple fact that it is just below the bust on many antoniniani. Besides, **P M** is only written at the end of the obverse in the first century for Galba (*M. & S.* i, 200, 203-7) and twice for Trajan (Strack, Pl. IV, 362, and a medallion, Gneecchi, xxi, 7), without being continued on the reverse. The legend of Germanicus from Caesarea Cappadociae as a provincial issue proves nothing apart from the fact that it is constitutionally impossible for **P M** here to be Pontifex Maximus. In *M. & S.* i, 104, **P M** is therefore read **Π M**.

²⁵ But Stein's further hypotheses based on the "Adventus" coins are incorrect, as these pieces belong to the year 247 when Philip returned from the Balkan war. Cohen 140/2 resembles Gneecchi, Pl. 109, 10; but as Elmer has correctly recognized it is Gneecchi, Pl. 27, 10, and belongs to Gallienus and his son.

2. THE NUMISMATIC MATERIAL.

A. Issues of Gordian III in Antioch.

I. With IMP CAES M ANT GORDIANVS AVG

As we know from Voetter's²⁶ investigations, Gordian in 238 and in the beginning of 239 in Rome used the long obverse IMP CAES M ANT GORDIANVS AVG. In 239, as already mentioned, a provincial mint was opened in Viminacium which also has this obverse. Only from the year III onwards, i.e. 241/242, certainly when the emperor himself came to Viminacium, does the short legend appear which we find in Rome in 239. This is not a matter of surprise, as provincial mints always lag a little behind. On the other hand, the exclusive use of the first legend for the early coinage of Viminacium would show that the order to strike and the patterns had been sent out in the summer of 239. Antioch now strikes antoniniani with the same legend and with the reverses of the first two years until about 241. There are two groups:

(a) Exactly like the originals in Rome.

Of 238:

FIDES MILITVM, PAX AVGVSTI, PROVIDENTIA AVG, VICTORIA AVG, VIRTVS AVG. The only one still lacking—so far at least—is the second officina with IOVI CONSERVATORI.

Of 239:

P M TR P II COS P P with Providentia as above, AEQVITAS AVG, CONCORDIA AVG, ROMAE AETERNAE.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 385 ff. On Mattingly's invitation I have rearranged the coins of Gordian and have in many cases come to quite different conclusions from Voetter. My results will be found in *M. & S.*, vol. iv.

That all these pieces belong to Antioch is proved primarily by the exact agreement with the silver tetradrachms in portrait and lettering [Pl. VI. 1 (Rome); 2 (with the same reverse from Antioch); 3 (tetradrachm)]. The heads are much rounder than in Rome, the lettering stiff and regular. But they still have the bust with P.b.²⁷ as in Rome. Pattern Roman antoniniani were then sent to Antioch with exact instructions, but nevertheless the peculiarities of Antioch style still come out. In particular the lettering remains unchanged as it was done with punches. The reason for this coinage, namely, the military preparations, has already been mentioned.

(b) altered types, also bust l., errors:

CONCORDIA AVG,	without cornucopiae	P.b. r.
„	as Pietas with cornucopiae [Pl. VI. 4]	P.b. r. C.b. l.
„	as Providentia	P.b. r.
FIDES MILITVM,	l. standard and cornucopiae	P.b. r. C.b. l.
„	l. standard	P.b. r.
„	seated l.	P.b. r.
LIBERALITAS AVG,	Libertas standing l.	P.b. r.
PAX AVGVSTI,	Virtus standing l.	P.b. r.
„	standing l. with branch and spear [Pl. VI. 5]	P.b. r. C.b. l.
P M TR P II COS P P,	Providentia as above	C.b. l.
„	Liberalitas	P.b. r.
„	emperor riding l.	P.b. r. P.f. l.
„	Jupiter seated l.	P.b. r.
P M TRI P COS P P,	emperor sacrificing	P.b. r.
„	Sol.	P.b. r.
POMAE (sic) AETERNAE		P.b. r.

²⁷ P.b. = Paludamentum from behind; P.f. = from front; C.b. = cuirass from behind.

PROVIDENTIA AVG,	pointing to globe	P.b. r.
„	Fortuna with rud- der and cornu- copiae	P.b. r.
„	Pietas with Altar and cornucopiae	P.b. r.
SPES PVPLICA (<i>sic</i>)	[Pl. VI. 6]	P.b. r.
VICTORIA AVG,	emperor riding l.	P.b. r.

This list is prepared from the Vienna collection, and may quite well be incomplete. We see that the mint is now left to itself, and therefore strikes irregularly. Typical of Antioch is the bust l. with C.b. [Pl. VI. 5] and also P.f. with the band over the breast, as on a tetradrachm of Philip [Pl. VI. 4 and 7]. The legends no longer agree with the types (so also with Pescennius Niger and with Septimius Severus at the beginning); as on coins of Elagabalus, the Liberalitas, which is never struck in Rome without the numeral of repetition, appears as Libertas,²⁸ in brief all characteristics of Antioch when it is not under Roman control.

II. With IMP GORDIANVS PIVS FEL AVG

FIDES MILITVM,	standing l. with standards	P.b. r. C.b. r.
FORTVNA REDVX,	seated l. without wheel	C.b. r.
IOVI CONSERVATORI,	standing l.	C.b. r.
MARTI PACIFERO,	advancing l.	P.b. r. C.b. r.
ORIENS AVG,	Sol.	C.b. r.
PAX AVGVSTI,	hastening l.	P.b. r. C.b. r.
PM TR P V COS II P P,	Hercules advancing r. [Pl. VI. 9, 10]	P.b. r. C.b. r.
SAECVLI FELICITAS,	Kaiser standing r. [Pl. VI. 11]	C.b. r.
VICTORIA AVG,	standing r.	P.b. r. C.b. r.
VICTORIA AVGVSTI,	advancing r.	P.b. r. C.b. r.
VICTORIA GORDIANI AVG		P.b. r. C.b. r.

²⁸ Pink, *Num. Z.*, 1933 and 1934, *Aufbau*, &c.

Here also the coins were at first struck in the Roman style with P.b. r. [Pl. VI. 8 (Rome), 9 (Antioch)]; the reverses belong for the most part to the years 240-242. Next comes an issue with C.b. r., large head and many new reverses [Pl. VI. 10 and 11]. As the emperor went to the east in 242 and captured Antioch, the coinage with this date began, with which PM TR PV agrees remarkably. He then left the town and never returned.

B. *Coinages of Philip.*

I. The coinage of tetradrachms in Antioch and the first Dura-Europos find.

Alfred B. Bellinger in *A.N.S. Monograph 49* has published two finds from the excavations in Dura-Europos,²⁹ the first of which is important for us. It dates from the period of the Persian war in the reign of Valerian. There are 140 antoniniani of Gordian; 38 of these certainly belong to Antioch, while the remainder cannot be identified as the obverse is not described. There may well have been a large number of Antioch coins among them. At any rate the percentage is considerable. For the sake of comparison I give the proportion of Rome to Antioch from several other finds: Couvron, *Annuaire*, 1877*, 107 : 1; Foi, *Rev. Num.*, 1874-7, 117 : 5; Sully, *Num. Chron.*, 1900, 44 : 2; Korong, *Közlöny*, 1903, 577 : 54; Nagyberki, *ibid.*, 1913, 341 : 19; Űsküb, *N.Z.*, 1908, 253 : 17; Rustschuk, *N.Z.*, 1918, 100 : 6; Smederevo, *Numismatičar*, 1931, 2391 : 246. The finds from the Balkans contain about 10 per cent., which is explained by the fact that the troops came back from the east. But

²⁹ Two other finds in no. 55.

while of the coins of Philip in the find of Smederevo³⁰ to 1499 Roman there were 30 of Antioch with P M—the others can no longer be exactly identified—in the Dura-Europos find there was only one such antoninianus. This is explained by the fact that the coins struck by him in Antioch were at once carried off by the troops to the Balkans. On the other hand there were 165 tetradrachms, which are exceedingly important. They fall into three groups (so also Bellinger): 1. Reverse MON VRB and mint-marks A-9 (S); only Philip I, Roman portrait, fine striking [Pl. VI. 12]. 2. For all three in the style of the earlier tetradrachms in Antiochene style, the son still as Caesar [Pl. VII. 1]. 3. With ANTIOXIA under the eagle, the eagle as on the coins of Trajan Decius; Philip II as Augustus Consulate Γ and Δ [Pl. VII. 2, 3].

The chronological arrangement is easy. Philip concluded peace in Antioch with the Persians and, as we have seen, struck antoniniani in celebration; the earliest with his authentic portrait—the early portraits elsewhere resemble that of his predecessor—and also tetradrachms by Roman workmen. The six issues which had already been experimentally issued in Rome under Gordian receive here for the first time mint-marks, the Milesian alphabetic numerals first introduced by Hadrian being used with S (9) for 6. These mint-marks later became general. Philip himself introduced them to Rome on the occasion of the secular games in A.D. 248/249. I have already stated in the introduction that the first issue of antoniniani by Gordian without the immediate occasion of war

³⁰ Cf. *N.Z.*, 1934, p. 108.

suggests that the custom of issuing imperial money outside of Rome gradually came into existence. Philip continued the experiment, and even marked the tetradrachms **MON VRB**. The evidence of all later analogies shows that this can only mean *Moneta urbis* or *urbica*, i.e. of the mint of Rome.³¹ The meaning is that these pieces are to be current throughout the empire.³² It was, it is true, only an experiment, which did not become an actuality until Gallienus (or according to Wruck, *Syr. Provincialprägung*, p. 10, earlier under Trebonianus Gallus), and was regularized under Diocletian.

The second group shows the return to the normal issue with poor portrait, the third was issued contemporaneously with the antoniniani of the secular games, i.e. 248/249. In 248 Philip became consul for the third time. This provincial mint then mechanically continues striking **VPATO Δ**, but already with poorer portrait [**Pl. VII. 3**] although he was never consul IIII, just as it also strikes **TR P VI**, while in Rome we only go down to **TR P V**. Such errors are not rare, especially in Antioch.

II. The antoniniani with P M.

A very interesting series is constituted by the antoniniani with **P M** struck immediately after the accession of Philip. They are as follows:

A. With **P M** under the bust and the celebration obverse legend **IMP IVL PHILIPPUS PIVS FEL AVG**

B. With **P M** at the end of the usual obverse legend, i.e. **IMP C M IVL PHILIPVS PF AVG P M**

The reverses are **PAX FVNDATA CVM PERSIS, SPES**

³¹ Cf. the gold medallion of Trier with **SMVR**, *N.Z.*, 1931, 17.

³² Cf. Mommsen, *Römisches Münzwesen*, 718.

FELICITATIS ORBIS, VIRTUS EXERCITVS, i.e. the Roman empire is secured by the peace, the emperor is the hope of the world, the strength is the army [Pl. VII. 4-9]. These pieces resemble in their whole



FIGS. 1, 2.

execution and in the large heads not only the latest antoniniani of Gordian of Antioch but also the tetradrachms with **MON VRB** [Pl. VI. 10-12] in portrait so much that there can be no doubt of their origin. In addition there are the legends so full of references to the conclusion of peace. With the style of Viminacium neither these nor the antoniniani of Gordian have a connexion. That these antoniniani were really celebration coinages for the troops is well shown in the Dura-Europos find in which there was only a single antoninianus of Philip, while in the Balkans these pieces are found because they were brought back there by the troops returning to their depots.

III. Copper of Antioch in Pisidia with P M.

The importance of this town as a result of its central position on the great military road is well known.



FIGS. 3, 4.

Gordian struck a great many coins there as did Philip also, at first with IMP C M (ligature?) IVL PHILIPPVS P F AVG P M as on the Antioch series B with the portrait of Gordian. These pieces were therefore attributed in the *B.M.C.* to his son, which is constitutionally impossible. The workmanship is still tolerable (Figs. 1, 2). On the other hand the later coinage with short legend is very rude.

IV. Bronze of Viminacium with P M.

As may be seen from Pick, *Die Münzen Moesiens*, p. 38, Philip strikes with ANNO V, i.e. 244/245, pieces with IMP IVL PHILIPPVS PIVS FEL AVG P M like

the Antioch series A. P alone is also found, but this is probably due simply to lack of space as the inscription was put on with punches. Here again the portrait shows features of Gordian's (Figs. 3, 4). This coinage only lasted a very short time; in the very same year coins were issued again with the normal reverse and the correct portrait.

V. The remaining antoniniani of Antioch.

As this coinage no longer pertains to my subject it need only be briefly mentioned. Philip II only appears as Augustus: therefore the beginning of this purely Antiochene issue is to be put in 247. The reverses agree with this. It is true that we find P M TR P III of the year 246 and the second legend of the empress with M OTACIL SEVERA AVG; but this is nothing remarkable as the provincial issues always lag a little behind the Roman. The remarkable dating P M TRP VI COS P P has already been mentioned [Pl. VII. 10-12].

3. THE RESULTS.

If we combine the historical information with the numismatic material we get the following picture. As a result of the continual attacks of the revived Persian empire to which Nisibis and Carrhae had fallen in the reign of Maximinus, the Roman government realized that it must brace itself for a great effort to secure peace on the eastern frontier. Just as a provincial mint was opened in Viminacium for the war in Moesia with the Capri, so, contrary to previous usage, moneyers were at once sent to Antioch with patterns from Rome and struck antoniniani there, the

first attempt at a second mint of the empire. When Sapor I immediately after his accession in 241 again declared war and Antioch fell, the time for the war with the Sassanians had come. In the spring of 242 the emperor took the well-known road through Moesia, Thrace, and the Bosphorus, into Asia, and on along the great military road. Antioch was soon recaptured. The coinage which had ceased in 241 began again with the issue of antoniniani in purely Roman style. But the second series with C.b. and large heads, as well as with special reverses like **VICTORIA GORDIANI AVG** and **SAECVLI FELICITAS** is already Antiochene. The emperor continued his victorious campaign. After the great victory at Rhesaina, Nisibis was retaken and the army advanced along the Chaboras and Euphrates towards Ctesiphon. Then Timesitheus died and Philip became "Praefectus Praetorio" and began his intrigues. In 244 Gordian died at Circesium. Philip's only anxiety was to conclude peace with the Persians in order to go to Rome and obtain recognition from the Senate. In Antioch a peace which brought little honour was concluded. Philip proudly called himself Parthicus Maximus on the antoniniani which were at once issued. He also issued tetradrachms which were to be current throughout the empire.³³ The emperor only remained a short time in the east. He distributed honours. Sicheu-Neapolis became a colony, Shuhba, the birthplace of Philip, was refounded as Philippopolis, Singara and Nisibis were given the epithet Julia.³⁴

The extensive coinage of Heliopolis³⁵ and Damascus

³³ Cf. above the pieces with **MON VRB.**

³⁴ Stein, *R.E.*, col. 706.

³⁵ Cf. above with Leg V Mac. VIII Aug.

is surprising, as under Philip I the provincial issues were elsewhere cut down. Whether we can deduce from this that the emperor made a short expedition to the south, and whether the coins of Damascus with *sebasmia* and agonistic urns mean that games were held in the presence of the emperor, are questions which cannot be discussed here.³⁶

From Antioch, where he was before Easter, as Eusebius³⁷ says in a somewhat embellished story, he now went north. The return journey was made partly by land through Eastern Europe, partly by sea.³⁸ The whole army went first of all to Antioch in Pisidia, the military centre of Galatia, Isauria, and Pisidia. Here, as has been pointed out already, we have the only provincial coinage with **P M**. From there a portion of the army took the old trade route to Ephesus, there to take ship to Europe; as Prof. Miltner kindly informs me, troops were often shipped from there. The army which went by land probably went by Apamea, Dorylaeum, and Nicomedia.³⁹

The emperor went through Thrace by the old imperial road to Rome. As Gaebler, *Z. f. N.* xxiv, 308 ff., shows, he made a detour by Beroea where games were held. In Viminacium the new reverse with **P M** was struck for a brief period, just as at Antioch in Pisidia. A milestone between Naissus and Viminacium (*C. I. L.* iii, 8269) shows us the route, the other stones (*C. I. L.*

³⁶ Cf. Cohen 330 for the father; 104 for Octacilia; for the son not distinguishable.

³⁷ 14 April 244; cp. Tillemont, i, 265, who also quotes *Chrysostomos contra Gentiles* and the *Chron. Alex.*

³⁸ Cf. Ritterling, "Legio", col. 1337.

³⁹ Cf. Tabula Peutingeriana.

iii, 4624, 10619, and 143564) with Parthicus Maximus the title. In Rome the only inscription found in the Praetorian camp gives the title Persicus Maximus. It then disappears. The emperor discarded it, as the peace with Persia did not meet with the approval of the Senate.

KARL PINK.

VIII.

THE STORY OF CONSTANTINE VII, PORPHYROGENITUS, FROM HIS SOLIDI.

[SEE PLATE VIII.]

A NEW variety of the solidus of Constantine VII and Romanus I having recently come to light, it may be of interest to review the series of solidi which so graphically depict the vicissitudes of the Emperor, Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

For a full appreciation of the significance of the latest discovery it must be recalled that Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus, was the son of Leo VI by his fourth wife, Zoe Carbonopsina, and was associated with his father and his uncle Alexander in the purple on his attaining his fourth year. On the death of Leo VI, on the 11th of May 912, Constantine continued as the youthful colleague of Alexander until the latter's death the following year. The young emperor was then but seven years old, and for the next six years the government passed into the hands of his mother, Zoe, and her ministers, but in 919 Constantine married Helena, daughter of his admiral Romanus, whom he immediately associated with himself on the throne. From this time the power of Zoe was suppressed and Constantine and his bride gradually relegated to the background, while Romanus assumed the dominant position in the empire. In 921 he caused his son Christopher to be crowned, and on the solidi, which it is thought were struck on this occasion, we find the

rightful emperor entirely ignored. It is true that he reappears on other issues of the triple reign, but always in a subordinate position to Romanus, and in one instance even to Christopher. Not until 945, when the star of Romanus and his family had set behind the lonely island of Protê, did Constantine VII regain his supremacy and appear alone on his solidi.

There are twelve coins which may be said to constitute the series, and their chronological sequence would appear to have been as follows.

LEO VI with his son CONSTANTINE VII

(A.D. June 911–11 May 912).

1. *Obv.* LEON ET CONSSAH⁵ A499' ROM' Leo VI, bearded, standing facing on l. with shorter figure of Constantine VII, beardless, on r. holding between them a long patriarchal cross. Both emperors wear the ornamental robe.

Rev. + IHS XPS REX REGNANTIUM Christ, bearded, seated facing on throne; r. hand raised in benediction. [Pl. VIII. 1.]

CONSTANTINE VII with his mother, ZOE

(A.D. 913–919).

2. *Obv.* CONSTANT' CE ZWHEHXWb' R' On l. bust of Constantine VII, beardless, facing; on r. bust of Zoe facing. They hold between them a patriarchal cross. Constantine wears mantle and robe; Zoe ornamental robe of lozenge pattern.

Rev. As last. [Pl. VIII. 2.]

CONSTANTINE VII and ROMANUS I

(A.D. 919–921).

3. *Obv.* CONSTANT' CE ROMAN' A499 b On l. bust of Constantine VII, beardless; on r. bust of Romanus I, bearded. Both emperors wear ornamental robe of lozenge pattern and are represented as of the same size. They hold between them a patriarchal cross.

Rev. As last. [Pl. VIII. 3.]

4. *Obv.* +CONSTANTINOSCE ROMAN ENXΩbR On l. Constantine VII, beardless; on r. taller figure of Romanus I, bearded, both standing facing. Constantine wears tunic and mantle, Romanus ornamental robe of square pattern.

Rev. As last. [Pl. VIII. 4.]

5. *Obv.* CONSTANTOE ROMAN A499bR On l. bust of Romanus I, bearded, facing; on r. shorter bust of Constantine VII, beardless, facing. Romanus wears ornamental robe of lozenge pattern, Constantine mantle and robe. They hold between them a patriarchal cross.

Rev. As last. [Pl. VIII. 5.]

6. *Obv.* ROMAN' ET CONSTANT' A499' b On l. bust of Romanus I, bearded, facing; on r. shorter bust of Constantine VII, beardless, facing. Romanus wears ornamental robe of lozenge pattern; Constantine mantle and robe. They hold between them a patriarchal cross.

Rev. As last. [Pl. VIII. 6.]

ROMANUS I and his son CHRISTOPHER

(A.D. 921-927?).

7. *Obv.* ROMAN' ET XPISTOFO' A499 b' On l. bust of Romanus I, bearded, facing, wearing ornamental robe of lozenge pattern; on r. bust of Christopher, beardless, facing, wearing mantle and robe. They hold between them a patriarchal cross.

Rev. As last. [Pl. VIII. 7.]

ROMANUS I, CONSTANTINE VII, and CHRISTOPHER

(A.D. 921-927?).

8. *Obv.* ROMAN' CONST' ETXPISTOF b R Romanus I, bearded, standing facing between smaller figures of Constantine and Christopher. Romanus holds sceptre in r. hand and wears ornamental robe; Constantine is represented beardless, and Christopher bearded. Both wear similar ornamental robes.

Rev. As last. [Pl. VIII. 8.]

9. *Obv.* +KEBOHΘEI ROMAHΩ TESPOTH On l. Romanus I, bearded, standing facing, wearing ornamental robe of square pattern, crowned by Christ standing on r.
- Rev.* COHSTANT' ET XPISTOF b' R' On l. bust of Constantine VII, bearded, facing, wearing ornamental robe of lozenge pattern; on r. bust of Christopher, bearded, facing, wearing mantle and robe. They hold a patriarchal cross between them. [Pl. VIII. 9.]
10. *Obv.* KEBOHΘEI ROM AHΩ TESPOTH Romanus I crowned by Christ as above.
- Rev.* XPISTOF ET COHSTANT' On l. bust of Christopher, bearded, facing; on r. bust of Constantine VII (bearded?) facing. They hold between them a patriarchal cross.

CONSTANTINE VII alone

(A.D. Jan.-Apl. 945).

11. *Obv.* +COHSTANT' AVT' CRATOR' Bust of Constantine VII, bearded, facing, wearing ornamental robe of square pattern and holding globus surmounted by patriarchal cross in r. hand.
- Rev.* +IHS XPS REX REGNANTIUM Bust of Christ, bearded, facing; r. hand in benediction. [Pl. VIII. 10.]

CONSTANTINE VII and his son ROMANUS II

(A.D. Apl. 945-Nov. 959).

12. *Obv.* COHSTANT' CE ROMAH AYGB'R On l. bust of Constantine VII, bearded, facing, wearing ornamental robe of lozenge pattern; on r. bust of Romanus II in mantle and robe. They hold between them a patriarchal cross.
- Rev.* As last. [Pl. VIII. 11.]

I have placed the newly discovered coin (no. 3) first of the four solidi bearing the names and representations of Constantine VII and Romanus I because it more

correctly represents the relative positions of the co-emperors at the commencement of their joint reign than do any of the others. Constantine occupies the place of honour on his colleague's right, his name precedes that of his father-in-law, and they both wear the ornamental lozenge-pattern robe. Moreover, both emperors are represented as of equal size. It is true that the type of no. 4 connects the coinage of Constantine with the last solidus of his father's reign (no. 1), and on this ground may have some claim to priority of issue, but on no. 4, not merely is Constantine represented as smaller than Romanus, but to the latter alone is conceded the ornamental robe.

On no. 5, although the name of Constantine still takes precedence of that of Romanus, yet Romanus is given the place of honour on the right, and he alone wears the ornamental robe. In this case, too, Constantine is represented as smaller than his co-emperor.

On no. 6 the usurpation of Romanus is carried a step farther. His name, as well as his effigy, takes precedence of that of Constantine, and the latter assumes in every detail the position of inferiority.

It remains, however, for no. 7 to complete the eclipse of the rightful sovereign. If, as has been thought, this solidus was struck upon the occasion of the coronation of Christopher, the coin, which was evidently issued in considerable numbers, may have been intended simply as a souvenir of the event, for it is followed by solidi upon which Constantine again makes his appearance, not merely in company with Christopher, but in some instances as his superior.

No. 8, so far as I am aware, has never before been described in this country. The coin is in the French

Cabinet, and I am indebted to M. Dieudonne, the curator, for the casts from which the illustrations are taken. I have placed this solidus *after* no. 7 because Christopher is represented as bearded, while on no. 7 he is beardless. I have placed it *before* no. 9 because Constantine is still represented as beardless, which he is not on no. 9.

With no. 9 we encounter a new obverse type, and the coin would appear to have been reproduced with the transposition of the emperors on the reverse (no. 10). Mr. Wroth on p. 460 of the *British Museum Catalogue*, in connexion with his type 3, gives references to de Saulcy and to the *Berlin Blätter* of 1865, but I have been unable to trace the present whereabouts of a specimen of this variety. It is unknown to the British, French, German, or Russian national cabinets.

The two remaining coins bring the story of the solidi to a peaceful and satisfactory ending.

With the exception of nos. 7 and 12, all the coins of the series are rare, some excessively so. I am indebted to the curator of the Hermitage Museum for casts of the solidus of Constantine VII and his mother, Zoe. This museum is the possessor of no less than three examples of this gem of the Byzantine coinage. The French coin (no. 8) and my own newly discovered coin (no. 3) are apparently unique.

HUGH GOODACRE.

IX.

A NEW BYZANTINE MINT, AND SOME EARLY UMAIYAD BRONZE COINS.

[SEE PLATE IX.]

AMONG a recent find of coins from Jerash (Gerasa) in Transjordan are several new types that cast some light on the bronze coinage of Syria and Palestine during the obscure period immediately before and after the Arab conquest. These coins are now in the custody of Mr. A. S. Kirkbride, Hon. Curator of Coins in the Museum of 'Ammān, who has very kindly allowed me to publish certain of them here, and to whom I am indebted for details as to provenance and weight. For the most part the coins were found in association with others of the regular Umayyad issues. The most important fact that emerges from their examination is the evidence for the existence of a mint in Byzantine times, hitherto unrecorded in the standard works on the subject. It also supplements certain conclusions arrived at by M. R. Cottevieille-Giraudet, in a recently published article in the *Revue Numismatique* (1934, pp. 199-219), in which he endeavoured to prove the existence of two additional mints operating under Byzantine control at that period, viz. Damascus and Caesarea Cappadociae.

A. *Pure Byzantine Type.*

I. Æ. 1.05; wt. 226 grs. (14.64). [Pl. IX. 1.]

Obv. Justin II and his Empress Sophia enthroned, facing, holding cruciform sceptres; cross above their heads; beginning at bottom l., upwards,
CKYΘο ΠΟΛΗC

Rev. M above, cross; l. downwards $\Lambda\text{N}\text{N}\text{O}$; r. downwards $\text{N}\text{I}\text{I}\text{O}$; in exergue NIK; officina mark Λ .

Judging from the reverse, this coin is based on a *folles* of the mint of Nikomedia of the year 8 of the reign of the Byzantine Emperor Justin II = A.D. 572-573 (cf. Wroth's *Cat.*, p. 87, no. 140). Instead, however, of having the legend DNIVSTI NVSPPAVG we have the unusual presence on the obverse of a mint-name SKYTHOPOLIS.

This is the first recorded occurrence on Byzantine coins of this mint-name. Scythopolis (or *Nysa-Scythopolis Samariae*) was situated near the river Jordan on the northern frontier of Samaria, and was a mint in Roman Imperial times (from Nero to Gordian).¹ It is not at all surprising to find these coins being unearthed in Transjordan, nor is it remarkable that the very common *folles* of Nikomedia should furnish the prototypes of what was undoubtedly a temporary provincial mint.

If this is a Byzantine coin struck in Palestine before the Arab conquest—and the absence of any trace of Arabic legend supports this—then it is surprising to find the mint-name written in full. As M. Cottevieille-Giraudet observes (*ibid.*, p. 213) the Byzantine practice of abbreviating the mint-names (e.g. NIKO for Nikomedia, as on the reverse of the above coin) might almost be considered “*une règle absolue*”. The presence of SKYTHOPOLIS therefore, is apparently a violation of this rule. In point of fact it may be compared with the mint-name *Damaskos* ($\Delta\Lambda\text{M}\alpha\text{C}\text{K}\text{O}\text{C}$) which occurs

¹ Head, *Hist. Num.*, p. 803.

The remarkable fact about this coin is that some years after it was struck at Scythopolis it was used as a flan by some Arab governor to bear the impress of the Islamic profession of faith. It is very significant, numismatically, that early Arab bronze coins of such an unusual size of flan and fabric, and with similar Arabic legends on obverse and reverse, are already known to us as the products of Palestinian mints (Gaza, Ludd, Askalon, Ramla, and Filistīn) during the early Umayyad rule in that region. This particular coin, therefore, reveals to us an important stage in the evolution of the Arab-Byzantine mint activities in the Palestinian province. To show the development I have added a typical coin of the mint of 'Askalān Filistīn for comparison.

The following is a description of the coin illustrated, which was presented to the British Museum by Mr. F. A. Harrison in 1932.

Æ. 1.1 ; wt. 55 grs. (3.56). [Pl. IX. 5.]

Obv. In centre : لا اله الا الله وحده

margin : الله الملك فلس (sic) واف

(*To Allah [belongs] the kingdom ; a fals of full weight.*)

Rev. In centre : محمد رسول الله

margin : ضرب بعسكلن فلسطين

(*Minted at 'Askalān [i.e. Ascalon] Filistīn.*)

It is a similar coin to Nützel's no. 2029, although he was unable to read the mint-name on the Berlin specimen.

V. Æ. 1.05 ; wt. 161 grs. (10.43). [Pl. IX. 6.]

Obv. Faint traces of two imperial figures as on no. I ;
bottom, countermark in Arabic طيب (=good).

Rev. **M** above, cross; l. and r. downward

Λ	[?]
N	X
N	I
o	

in exergue, o>||N; officina mark Γ

This specimen differs from no. I chiefly in officina mark and date, and also in having the mint-name (NIKO) retrograde. We have here an instance of an old Byzantine coin sanctioned for currency under the new Arab régime by virtue of an approved counter-mark.

VI. Æ. 1.05; wt. 128.2 grs. (8.31). [Pl. IX. 7.]

Obv. Two figures standing facing, each girt with a sword; between them, on three steps, a tall standard with globe.²

Rev. **M** with six-pointed star above; officina mark Λ; marginal inscription in Arabic partly obliterated, beginning top r. downwards

الملك ا مما ا [مر به ؟]

... عبد مير بسم الله [عبد الله]

(i.e. *In Allah's name, [this coin is] of what was ordered by Allah's servant, 'Abd al-Malik, Commander [of the Faithful].*)

VII. Æ. 1.05; wt. 171 grs. (11.08). [Pl. IX. 8.]

Obv. As no. VI, but not so distinct.

² Mr. Kirkbride, in a letter, rightly observes that the central object resembles a spear, but there are distinct traces of a globe towards the top of the shaft, and from a comparison with other well-known Arab imitations of Byzantine symbolism, we know that the prototype was a tall cross erected on three steps, not improbably, in fact, the "Holy Rood" itself which Heraclius retrieved from the Persians (A.D. 629).

Rev. As no. VI, but legend less clear, though the words عبد الله at the bottom are quite distinct.

These Arab-Byzantine coins must, therefore, have been struck during the caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān, the fifth Umayyad Caliph (A.H. 65-86 = A.D. 685-705). The two standing figures differ from the imperial figures of their Byzantine prototype in being girt with swords, instead of holding the emblems of Christian sovereignty, the cruciform globus and sceptre. It may be noted in passing, also, that each is wearing native head-dress, such as the Amir of Transjordan wears to this very day, with its folds falling down both sides of the head. Several writers³ in describing this standing figure of the Caliph, as it appears on the well-known pure Arabic type, have been misled by the folds of the Bedouin head-gear, and have described the Caliph as being bare-headed with long flowing locks of hair. The objections to this interpretation should have been apparent from the outset: (a) it is not a general Arab custom to allow the hair of the head to grow long, and (b) it would have been taboo for a good Muslim to appear with uncovered head. Although the present-day coins of the late King Faiṣal of 'Irāk show that Muslim monarch as bareheaded, such a violation of convention would have been unheard of in the early days of Islam.

It is noteworthy, too, that this type with the two

³ E.g. Lavoix, *ibid.*, no. 56; Nützel, *Berlin Cat.*, i, nos. 34, 35. M. Cottevieille-Giraudet makes the same mistake unfortunately (*ibid.*, p. 203) where he thus describes a similar figure of the Caliph on one of the regular issues of 'Abd al-Malik: "*la tête découverte laisse de longs cheveux séparés par une raie médiane retomber en deux boucles qui se retournent vers l'extérieur de part et d'autre du visage.*"

figures standing on each side of a tall cross on steps is already known from Arab-Byzantine coins of Baalbek (there is an excellent example in the American Numismatic Society's Collection) where the figures still bear the imperial insignia. It is only by procuring from site finds more and more specimens, as illuminating as the above, that we shall be able to elucidate the numismatic data of this very important transition period in the history of the Near East.

J. WALKER.


X.

MIR JA'FAR'S PLASSEY MEDAL.

The subject of this article is a gold medal issued by Mir Muḥammad Ja'far Khān, Nawab of Bengal, in commemoration of Robert Clive's famous victory gained at Plassey on June 23, 1757, over Ja'far's predecessor, Nawab Sirāj al-Daula. The piece is broad and thin, the language and characters are Persian, and the letters are cut by hand in the fashion of a seal. I know of two specimens from electrotypes in the British Museum Coin Room. Probably a third exists.

The inscription begins with a formal profession of service to the puppet emperor 'Ālamgīr II by Mir Ja'far, as governor of a Province of the Mughal Empire. Mīr Ja'far and his titles occupy the place of honour in the legend, though he did little or nothing on the field to win the battle of Plassey; he was the figure-head of the conspiracy against Sirāj al-Daula. The epithet Mahābat-i-Jang, Terror or Portent of War, was the distinctive title of 'Alivardī Khān, the founder of the line, who was succeeded by Sirāj al-Daula. We are told that "as Mīr Ja'far was ambitious of copying Mahābat-i-Jang, he assumed the same titles on his seals".¹ Next in the inscription comes Colonel Clive, the actual commander and victor in the battle which gave Bengal to the British. The engagement was fought on the fifth of Shawwāl (tenth month) of the

¹ Jonathan Scott, *History of Dekkan and Bengal*, London, 1794, vol. ii, p. 371.



Hijrī year 1170, or June 23, A.D. 1757, and the medal is dated the 11th Shawwāl. The context and order of the words indicate that the date on the medal is intended to be that of the battle, but it is six days wrong.

The name of the recipient is in Persian letters like the rest of the legend. One name is جان والش, clearly John Walsh; the other الکسندر چمپین must be Alexander Champion. John Walsh was Clive's kinsman by marriage and private secretary; after retiring from India, Walsh made a reputation as a man of science. The Walsh medal is the better piece of the two. There is probably a third medal in Germany belonging to one

Obverse.

- (1) فدوی عالمگیر بادشاہ غاز شجاع الملک
 حسام الدولہ میر محمد جعفر خان بہادر
 جنگ
 مہابت در عمل سرداری کیرنیل کلیب نظر بر شجا
 جان والش کہ بتاریخ یازدہم شہر شوال المکرم
 سنہ ۱۱۷۰ ہجری در میدان پلاسی نمود بنابران خطا
 بہادری عنایت کرد

“The servant of the Emperor and Ghāzī, ‘Ālamgīr, Shujā al-Mulk (Hero of the Realm), Hisām al-Daula (Sword of the State), Mīr (Prince) Muḥammad Ja’far Khān Bahādur, Mahābat-i-Jang (Portent of War), having regard to the courage under the leadership of Colonel Clive, which John Walsh on the eleventh of the noble month Shawwāl of the Hijrī year 1170, displayed on the field of Plassey, on account of that, the token of heroism was granted.”

Reverse.

Conventional representation of Dhu’l-Faḳār, the sword of ‘Alī.

AV. 1.6.

(2) As (1) but الکسندر چمپن instead of جان والش, and کردید instead of کرد.

line of the descendants of George Frederick Gaupp, who commanded the Madras Europeans at Plassey.”

The circumstances attending the actual bestowal of

² Mr. John Allan, Keeper of the Coins, British Museum, has kindly given me this information.

the medal and the choice of recipients must at present remain matter for conjecture, though the story of the stirring events in Bengal during the years A.D. 1756 and 1757 has been told in great detail.³ The empire of the Great Mughal was falling to pieces; 'Alivardī Khān, Mahābat-i-Jang, had made himself practically independent ruler of the Provinces of Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa. This able soldier of fortune died in April, 1756, and was succeeded by a favourite grandson, Nawab Sirāj al-Daula, at the age of nineteen. An influential minister was Mir Ja'far 'Alī Khān, who had married 'Alivardī's half-sister, and was Bakhshī or Paymaster of the Army. The young and headstrong Nawab quickly picked a quarrel with the local representatives of the East India Company. He marched with a large force from his capital, Murshidābād, on the 5th June, and covered the distance of 160 miles to Calcutta in eleven days. The British land forces were aided by some ships, including the sloop *Chance* under Captain Alexander Champion, but the defences were quite inadequate and Fort William capitulated on June 20. The Black Hole episode took place the same night.

When the disturbances in Bengal first broke out, the Council at Fort William (Calcutta) wrote to Fort St. George (Madras) for reinforcements. On August 16, 1756, the Madras Council received the news of the fall of Calcutta. Colonel Robert Clive, who was at the time Deputy Governor of Fort St. David (just south of Pondicherry), returned to Madras on August 24, and volunteered to command an expedition to Bengal.

³ See S. C. Hill, *Bengal in 1756-1757*, Indian Records Series, 3 vols., London, 1905.

War with France was imminent and troops could ill be spared, but it was decided to send a combined force to recover Calcutta, Admiral Charles Watson in command by sea and Colonel Robert Clive by land. A member of Council and Mr. John Walsh were to accompany Clive as representatives of the Madras Council, and Mr. Walsh was appointed Paymaster to the force. The tiny fleet sailed on October 16; after a tedious and trying voyage only part of it had arrived in the lower Hugli by December 13. Fort William was retaken on January 2, 1757. The scene of the military operations which followed was the flat riverain tract between Calcutta and the Nawab's capital, Murshidābād. Nawab Sirāj al-Daula with a large army had penetrated to the outskirts of Calcutta, and was visited on February 4 by Messrs. Walsh and Scrafton as Clive's representatives. On the next day was fought a partial action with more casualties on the British side than in the decisive battle of Plassey itself. Among the killed was Mr. Belcher, Clive's private secretary; Walsh succeeded to the post. The Nawab retreated and agreed to a peace of a temporizing nature, which was signed on February 9. The conditions included a concession to the East India Company of the right to strike money at Calcutta of equal weight and fineness to that of Muxadabad (Murshidābād), but the mint-name was to be 'Alinagar. Complicated intrigues between the Nawab, the British, and the French were cut short by the capitulation of Chandarnagore to the British on March 23. On April 10, Clive wrote to the Nawab specifying the articles of the treaty which he had not yet fulfilled, which included the currency of the *siccās* (rupees)

coined at Calcutta or 'Alinagar.⁴ The Nawab's reply was to threaten a new war. This brought matters to a fresh crisis, and the pro-British party were ready to assist in the overthrow of Sirāj al-Daula. Mīr Ja'far was willing to take the Nawab's place and to confirm all the grants and privileges demanded from Sirāj al-Daula; he signed a new treaty with Clive and his Select Committee on June 4, which included stipulations about the mint at Calcutta. Nawab Sirāj al-Daula was warned of his danger and marched to join his army of fifty thousand men at Plassey, where he awaited Clive's approach. His numbers vastly exceeded those of Clive, but the Nawab was surrounded by traitors and had good reason to distrust his army, especially that section commanded by Mīr Ja'far. The famous fight took place on June 23, the anniversary of the accession of King George II (Old Style). "While the ships at Calcutta were firing salutes in the King's honour, Clive and his men were fighting a battle, the ultimate result of which was to add to the King's dominions the greatest dependency ever held by a European Power."⁵ The demoralized troops of Sirāj al-Daula made little resistance, and Mīr Ja'far did nothing for either party. Sirāj al-Daula fled to Murshidābād, and the next day, June 24, Mīr Jā'far was saluted in Clive's camp as the new Nawab of Bengal, Bihar, and Orissa. The British troops made a short march on the evening of the 24th, and about noon on the following day arrived in the vicinity of Murshidābād. As soon as the army was encamped

⁴ The only known specimen of this issue was published in *Num. Chron.*, 1930, p. 218.

⁵ S. C. Hill, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. excix.

Colonel Clive sent Mr. Watts and Mr. Walsh, attended by a company of sepoy, to pay Mir Ja'far a visit of ceremony. Clive himself with a suitable escort entered the city of Murshidābād, to quote his own words, "as extensive, populous, and rich as the City of London", on the morning of the 29th. Later in the day he visited the palace, where he was awaited in the hall of audience by Mir Ja'far with all the great officers of the city. Clive seated Mir Ja'far on the throne and acknowledged him as the new Nawab.⁶ The mint charter was received at the end of July. "A mint has been established in Calcutta; continue coining gold and silver into Siccās (silver) and Mohurs (gold) of the same weight and standard with those of Moorshadabad; the impression to be Calcutta." Clive, with pardonable pride, referred to this deed in his letter to the Court of Directors of January 10, 1758. "The word Alinagore is, by our present sunnud (charter), to be omitted in the impression on our siccās, an indulgence we could not obtain from Suraja Dowla."⁷

John Walsh was in attendance on Clive throughout these operations. He and Mr. Watts conveyed Clive's congratulations to Mir Ja'far on June 25, just the kind of service to receive a special reward. On the other hand, I can find no specific mention of Champion's activities during these fateful months of the year 1757. He certainly took part in the defence of Calcutta in 1756, when he appears to have deserted the sea for the land.⁸ He must have been a good

⁶ Robert Orme's *History of Indostan*, London, 1778, vol. ii, p. 181.

⁷ *Num. Chron.*, 1930, p. 220.

⁸ The references are in the Index to S. C. Hill, *op. cit.*, vol. iii. There is some confusion here.

soldier, because he played a prominent part in the Rohilla War, and succeeded Sir Robert Barker as Commander-in-Chief of the Bengal Army in 1774. George Frederick Gaupp went out to Madras as Lieutenant of the 1st Swiss Company, arriving in 1752. In 1756 he was commandant of the small garrison at Karunguli. He accompanied Clive's expedition to Bengal, was wounded in Clive's attack on Sirāj al-Daula's camp in January 1757, and commanded the Madras Europeans at Plassey.⁹

By 1759 Walsh had returned to England; in 1761 he became M.P. for Worcester, his main object being to form a Parliamentary interest in Clive's support.¹⁰ Walsh corresponded with Clive and with Warren Hastings. His main interests were scientific, and he was the first person to make accurate experiments on the torpedo fish. He was elected F.R.S. in 1770 and was twice awarded the Copley Medal. Walsh died unmarried on March 9, 1795, in London. He left his property to a Sir John Benn who had married the daughter of Walsh's sister. Benn assumed the additional name of Walsh, and was the father of Sir John Benn Walsh, first Baron Ormathwaite.

R. B. WHITEHEAD.

⁹ I am indebted to Professor H. H. Dodwell for the information about Gaupp.

¹⁰ There is a notice in the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

XI.

THE BROOKE MEMORIAL.

It will be remembered that after the death of Dr. G. C. Brooke a small committee consisting of the President of the Royal Numismatic Society, the President of the British Numismatic Society, the Keeper of Coins in the British Museum, and myself was formed to appeal for funds for the



purchase of an important English coin to be placed in the British Museum as a memorial of Dr. Brooke's work on English coins. Mr. C. E. Blunt acted as Treasurer.

The coin has now been purchased and presented to the National Collection. A sentimental interest attaches to the piece as it was the last coin handled by Dr. Brooke, to whom I took it during his illness; he realized its importance and expressed the hope that it would be acquired for the nation.

The coin is a heavy noble (wt. 107.6 grns.) of the type regular from Edward III to Henry VI. There are four ropes from the stern and one rope from the prow; three lis in the French arms. The ship ornaments appear to be lion, lis, lion, lis. There is a quatrefoil at the king's wrist.

Obv. Legend $\text{E/DWTRD' DI' GR\text{A} \times \text{R} \times \text{A} \times \text{N} \times \text{G} \times \text{L} \times$
 $\text{Z} \times \text{F} \times \text{R} \times \text{T} \times \text{R} \times \text{D} \times \text{O} \times \text{N} \times \text{S} \times \text{H} \times \text{Y} \times \text{B}'$; saltire stops. The rose-mark before E/DWTRD

Rev. m.m. lis, $\text{I} \times \text{H} \times \text{Q} \times \text{T} \times \text{V} \times \text{T} \times \text{R} \times \text{S} \times \text{O} \times \text{N} \times \text{S}$ (*sic*) $\text{P} \times \text{E} \times \text{R} \times \text{M} \times \text{E}$
 $\text{D} \times \text{I} \times \text{V} \times \text{M} \times \text{I} \times \text{O} \times \text{R} \times \text{V} \times \text{I} \times \text{B} \times \text{T} \times \text{T}$; $\text{E} \cdot$ in central compartment.

Two specimens of the heavy noble were previously known, one of which is in the Museum. This new coin differs materially from the other two in that it has an initial

mark, a rose, on the obverse. There is no mark on the others, but as they more closely resemble nobles of Henry VI than does this one they should be slightly earlier. The earlier coins both have a lis below the shield and a pellet on each side of the king's crown. The new coin has not these marks but has a quatrefoil at the king's wrist. The suggestion is that the two coins with lis and pellets agree with the first heavy groats, which also had these marks on the obverse, and that the Brooke memorial coin may have come immediately after, when the mark on the groat became a rose and quatrefoils were added at the sides of the neck.

The following is a list of subscribers. (The appeal was limited to those interested in Dr. Brooke's work.)

J. Allan, Esq.
 F. W. Armitage, Esq.
 Messrs. A. H. Baldwin & Sons
 A. E. Bagnall, Esq.
 C. E. Blunt, Esq.
 L. Cabot Briggs, Esq.
 H. H. Brindley, Esq.
 W. A. Brooke, Esq.
 Frank E. Burton, Esq.
 Major P. W. P. Carlyon-Britton
 V. B. Crowther-Reynon, Esq.
 H. J. Dakers, Esq.
 H. Daniels, Esq.
 The Essay Club
 Sir Arthur Evans, F.R.S.
 Lady Evans
 Miss Farquhar
 L. Forrer, Esq.
 Messrs. Glendining & Co.
 Lord Grantley
 S. W. Grose, Esq.
 G. C. Haines, Esq.
 Christopher Hawkes, Esq.
 Sir George Hill, K.C.B.
 Norman Hill, Esq.
 Horace H. King, Esq.
 The Kent Numismatic Society
 Robert Kerr, Esq.
 L. A. Lawrence, Esq.
 E. Thurlow Leeds, Esq.
 H. M. Lingford, Esq.
 Dr. A. H. Lloyd
 R. Cyril Lockett, Esq.

Professor T. O. Mabbott
 Sir George Macdonald, K.C.B.
 H. Mattingly, Esq.
 J. Mavrogordato, Esq.
 J. Gralton Milne, Esq.
 Ivo Pakenham, Esq.
 Sir Charles Peers
 J. W. E. Pearce, Esq.
 C. W. Phillips, Esq.
 F. N. Pryce, Esq.
 Professor E. J. Rapson
 E. S. G. Robinson, Esq.
 Dr. Kenneth Rogers
 V. J. E. Ryan, Esq.
 F. S. Salisbury, Esq.
 A. C. Savin, Esq.
 B. A. Seaby, Esq.
 J. S. Shirley-Fox, Esq.
 J. S. Shirley-Fox, Esq., in
 memory of H. B. Earle-Fox
 Messrs Spink & Son, Ltd.
 W. G. Smith, Esq.
 H. W. Taffs, Esq.
 A. B. Tonnochy, Esq.
 Monsieur Victor Tournour.
 Monsieur A. Visart de Bocarmé.
 J. Walker, Esq.
 Percy H. Webb, Esq.
 Dr. & Mrs. Mortimer Wheeler
 R. B. Whitehead, Esq.
 Miss M. E. Wood
 H. Nelson Wright, Esq.

L. A. LAWRENCE.



HIMERA (1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11) AND SELINUS (2, 4, 6, 8, 12) 1.



13



14



15



16



17



18



19



20



21



22



23



24





25



26



27



28



29



30



31



32



33



34



35



36



37





1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



11



12





1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



11



12





1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



11



12




1

2

3

4



PROCEEDINGS OF THE
ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY.

SESSION 1934—1935.

OCTOBER 18, 1934.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E., President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the Meeting of May 17 were read and approved.

Colonel Oscar Ulrich-Bansa and Mr. Welborn Owston Smith were proposed for election.

Mr. L. A. Lawrence, F.S.A., exhibited on behalf of Mr. Baldwin a very rare heavy noble of Edward IV.

Mr. L. G. P. Messenger showed the South African penny of 1934 and a set of the new coinage of the Fiji Islands. He also showed a series of Serbian coins.

Mr. B. A. Seaby exhibited an aureus of Trajan S·P·Q·R· OPTIMO PRINCIPI in wreath; a sestertius of Antoninus Pius, S·P·Q·R· AN· F· F· OPTIMO PRINCIPI PIO; a bronze medallion of Gordian III, ADLOCVTIO AVGVSTI, S·C·, and a silver coin of Priscus Attalus.

Mr. W. Gilbert, M.S.A., exhibited an aureus of Nero and his mother (Cohen no. 1, wt. 117·5) from the Kaufmann collection.

Mr. H. P. Hall showed two first brass of Trajan with reverses, the Temple of Jupiter and the Via Trajana and the same types in gold and silver.

Mr. Henry Garside showed the New Zealand coins (2s. 6d., 2s., 1s., 6d., and 3d.) of 1933 and an Austrian nickel schilling and fifty groschen of 1934.

The President expressed his sense of the very great loss which the Society had sustained by the death of Dr. G. C. Brooke and a vote of sympathy with Mrs. Brooke was passed.

Mr. Mattingly read a paper on "Trajan, Optimus princeps". The Roman Empire professed to give its subjects the best of possible governments—security and prestige abroad; order, concord, and liberty at home. Of this profession the coins often bear eloquent record; but the check with history often exposes the profession as hollow. The reign of Trajan, however, is of peculiar interest, because in it promise and fulfilment were not far apart, and the state did actually enjoy admirable government under a prince, whom all honoured as "optimus". This theme of the ideal state under the ideal prince was then illustrated by a series of coin-slides, covering the whole reign of Trajan. It was shown how the various virtues of his government are celebrated in turn—his care for the material welfare of the city, his vigorous foreign policy, his constitutionalism and love of liberty. The restoration of Republican denarii and imperial aurei in A.D. 107 appeared as a conscious claim on the part of Trajan to have reconciled the incompatibles, autocracy and liberty, and to have harmonized ancient discords in the general ideal of service of the Roman state.

NOVEMBER 15, 1934.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E., President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the Meeting of October 18 were read and approved.

The President announced that the Council had awarded the Society's medal posthumously to Dr. Brooke and sent it to Mrs. Brooke.

Mr. Welborn Owston Smith, M.A., and Colonel Oscar Ulrich-Bansa, were elected Fellows of the Society.

Mr. A. H. F. Baldwin exhibited a complete set of Charles II shillings.

Mr. Henry Garside exhibited the 10 and 5 fen of Manchukuo year 2=1933, and the 10 and 5 lire of the Vatican 1933-4.

Mr. B. H. St. J. O'Neil showed a unique miliarensis of Honorius, *rev.* **VIRTVS EXERCITVM** from Hull.

Mr. B. A. Seaby showed the very rare Indian Chief medal of William IV, and on behalf of Mr. V. J. E. Ryan he showed Briot's half unite, unpublished with mint-mark anchor. Not struck in Briot's mill, like his other coins, but hammered like the rest of the contemporary coinage, save perhaps the unite of the same mint-mark.

Mr. W. Gilbert, M.S.A., showed the following aurei of Nero to illustrate development of his portraiture:

1. *Rev.* Shield. **NERONI•CLAVDIO•DRVSO•GERM•PRINCIPI•IVVENT.** (Coh. 96, wt. 120.0.)

2. *Rev.* Sacrificial Implements. **NERO•CLAVD•CAES•DRVSVS•GERM•PRINC•IVVENT.** (Coh. 311, wt. 118.5.)

3. *Rev.* Figure (Rome) standing to left. **NERO•CAESAR•AVG•IMP.** From the Ransom Coll. (Coh. 221, wt. 116.0.)

4. *Rev.* The Emperor standing. **NERO•CAESAR•AVGVSTVS•GERMANICVS.** (Coh. 44, wt. 111.5.)

5. *Rev.* Salus. **NERO•CAESAR•AVGVSTVS.** From the Boscoreale find and Huth Coll. (Coh. 313, wt. 112.5.)

6. *Rev.* Juppiter Custos. **IMP NERO CAESAR AVGVSTVS.** From the Boscoreale find. (Coh. 120, wt. 112.5.)

Mr. Fredk. A. Harrison, F.Z.S., exhibited a series of coins of Milan from the twelfth century to 1848.

Dr. S. H. Fairbairn exhibited a medal of Rockingham: *Obv.* "To the Restorer of Commerce 1766: *Rev.* Ship, America: Thanks to the Friends of Liberty and Trade."

Mr. J. Allan, F.S.A., read a note on a new sterling of Lorraine copied from a penny of Alexander III.

He also read a note by Mr. Howland Wood on the first coinage of the Ionian Islands. (This is printed in this volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, pp. 47-9.)

Mr. J. W. E. Pearce, F.S.A., read a note on a fourth-century find from Woodbridge. (This is printed in this volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, pp. 49-53.)

The President read a note by Mr. Gilbert Askew on a third-century hoard from Blackmoor. (This is printed in this volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, pp. 55-6.)

DECEMBER 20, 1934.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E., President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the Meeting of November 15 were read and approved.

Mr. W. Gilbert, M.S.A., exhibited an aureus of Domitia (Coh. 10, wt. 120), *rev.* showing her infant son, from the Evans, Weber, Gariazzo, and Sir Arthur Evans collections.

Mr. Henry Garside showed the Dolfuss memorial 2-schilling piece of Austria and the French nickel 5-franc piece of 1933.

Mr. J. Allan, F.S.A., read a paper by Mr. John Walker on a number of new coins of early Arab governors of Persia. (This paper was printed in the *Numismatic Chronicle*, 1934, pp. 284-9.)

Mr. L. A. Lawrence, F.S.A., read a note on a new coin of Henry II of Newark, a hitherto unknown mint for the period. (This paper is printed in this volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, pp. 38-41.)

Mr. Allan read notes by Miss Anne S. Robertson on finds of Roman coins from Linwood, Cambridgeshire, and St. Mary Cray, Kent. (These papers are printed in this volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, pp. 57-62, and 62-66.)

JANUARY 17, 1935.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E., President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the Meeting of December 20 were read and approved.

M. Paul Tinchant was proposed for election as a Fellow of the Society.

Mr. R. Cyril Lockett, F.S.A., exhibited a very large bronze coin of Carthage weighing 1488 grains.

Mr. W. Gilbert, M.S.A., showed an aureus of Plotina, *rev.* Vesta seated.

Mr. H. Garside exhibited a pattern copper pfennig of Brunswick 1846 and the Spanish peseta of 1933.

The President exhibited two French bronze medals of the First Empire, one commemorating the visit of the Empress Marie Louise to the Paris mint in 1813 and the other a medal of Caroline Bonaparte, sister of Napoleon I.

Mr. R. B. Whitehead read a paper on the gold medal presented by Mir Ja'far to certain English officers after the battle of Plassey. (This paper is printed in this volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, pp. 127-34.)

Dr. S. H. Fairbairn gave a lecture illustrated by slides on the medals of the French Revolution in which he showed how well the changes in popular feeling are expressed in the medals of the five which were propagandist as well as historical.

FEBRUARY 21, 1935.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E., President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the Meeting of January 17 were read and approved.

Mr. Paul Tinchant was elected a Fellow of the Society.

Mr. A. H. F. Baldwin exhibited a unique siege-piece of Charles I, the Pontefract unite in gold, a Petition and a Reddite crown and a 1662 crown in gold.

Mr. H. P. Hall showed a gold coin of Carausius and another of Allectus and a rare brass of Carausius.

Mr. H. Garside showed a silver medal on the investiture of the Prince of Wales in 1911 and the silver florin of Australia commemorating the centenary of Melbourne 1934-5.

Mr. C. J. Bunn showed some Byzantine gold coins.

Dr. A. H. Lloyd, F.S.A., read a paper on the coin types of Selinus and the legend of Empedocles in which he showed reason for rejecting the traditional explanation of the Selinus types as relating to the engineering work of Empedocles, and proposed to see in them references to the alliance with Himera against Agrigentum. (This paper is printed in this volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*, pp. 73-93.)

MARCH 21, 1935.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E., President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the Meeting of February 21 were read and approved.

Messrs. Herbert Cahn and Louis Strauss were proposed for election as Fellows of the Society.

Mr. L. Forrer exhibited the following coins:

1. Gold stater of Cotys I, king of Bosphorus (A.D. 46-78), with bust of Agrippina junior on *rev*.

2. Aureus of Licinius junior, *d.* 326, with facing bust of youthful Emperor. *Rev.* Zeus seated. From the mint of Nicomedia.

3. Silver medallion of Philip I (A.D. 244-9). *Rev.* The three Monetae. Var. Coh. 14. (From Prince Waldeck's collection.) Gneecchi quotes only two specimens.

4. Bronze medallion of Carus (A.D. 282-3). *Rev.* The three Monetae. Coh. 41. (From Prince Waldeck's collection.)

Mr. H. Garside exhibited the aluminium bronze centenary ten-centavo piece of Uruguay (1830-1930) and the nickel 25 centimos of Spain 1934.

Mr. W. Gilbert, M.S.A., exhibited an aureus of Aurelian, *rev.* VIRTVS ILLYRICI: (Coh. 282, wt. 82.5) from the Montagu, Weber, Vogel, and Evans collections.

Mr. L. A. Lawrence, F.S.A., showed a series of coins to illustrate serration.

Rev. E. A. Sydenham read a paper on the origin of the serrati of the Roman Republic in which he said that the

considerations which led to the adoption of this form were not so much practical as religious and to be traced to the influence of solar cults and wheel symbols in other lands. (This paper is printed in this volume of the *Numismatic Chronicle*.)

Mr. Lawrence, the President, Mr. Mattingly, and Mr. Gilbert took part in the discussion which followed.

APRIL 25, 1935.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E., President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the Meeting of March 21 were read and approved.

Messrs. Herbert A. Cahn and Louis Strauss were elected Fellows of the Society, and Dr. J. C. S. Rashleigh was proposed for election.

The evening was devoted to exhibitions.

Mr. C. J. Bunn exhibited a set of 59 medals by Dassier and his son depicting scenes from the history of republican Rome.

Mr. H. Garside showed an Abyssinian nickel 10-cent and bronze 5- and 1-cent, and the Turkish 25-paras of 1928.

Mr. H. W. Taffs exhibited a fine set of the Hudson Bay Co.'s tokens, a Jersey nickel proof $\frac{1}{12}$ -shilling 1877, pennies of Henry VIII of Canterbury and London, a Stephen penny of London, and a Hanover mining thaler of 1752.

Mr. W. Gilbert, M.S.A., exhibited four aurei of Vespasian (*rev.* bull (C. 112), wt. 111 grs. ; *rev.* temple (C. 578), wt. 111.5 grs. ; *rev.* Judaea Capta (C. 225), wt. 113 grs. ; *rev.* Titus on Domitian (C. 4), wt. 113.5 grs.).

Mr. R. B. Whitehead exhibited the official seal of George Frederic Harvey, Commissioner of Delhi, dated 1855.

Mr. H. P. Hall exhibited a fine set of contorniates and gave some account of the suggestions which had been made to explain them. He also showed some fine Shrewsbury coins of Charles I.

The draft of the following loyal address to His Majesty on his semi-Jubilee was approved and ordered to be sealed :

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty.

May it please Your Majesty,

We, the President, Council, and Fellows of the Royal Numismatic Society, humbly beg leave to approach Your Majesty, our Gracious Patron, and to offer our loyal congratulations on the completion of the twenty-fifth year of a reign which passing as it has done through times of stress and anxiety, has been specially marked by the constant growth of the loyalty of the peoples of Your Majesty's Empire and of their deep affection for their Sovereign's Throne and Person.

The past twenty-five years have been years of steady progress in the science to which this Society is devoted. Important contributions have been made to the advancement of the knowledge of the numismatics of this country and of other lands, ancient and modern, and the Society has endeavoured to show that it is worthy of Your Majesty's Gracious patronage.

That Your Majesty and Her Majesty the Queen may long continue to rule over a happy and prosperous people will be our earnest prayer.

Given under our Common Seal at our apartments in 22 Russell Square this the twenty-fifth day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty-five and in the year of Your Majesty's reign the twenty-fifth.

(Signed) PERCY H. WEBB.
President.

MAY 16, 1935.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E., President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the Meeting of April 29 were read and approved.

Messrs. Henry Garside and Leopold G. P. Messenger were appointed Auditors.

Dr. John Cosmo Stuart Rashleigh was elected a Fellow of the Society.

Mr. Garside, through the kindness of Miss Ethel Elizabeth Gladden Purchase, exhibited on her behalf a specimen of "The King's Silver Jubilee Medal".

The following is a description of the medal which has been designed by Sir William Goscombe John, R.A. :

Obverse. Legend: GEORGE·V·AND·QUEEN MARY·MAY·VI·MCMXXXV. Conjoint busts of Their Majesties The King and Queen, crowned and robed, looking to the left.

Reverse. The Royal Cipher GRI in script letters with the Imperial Crown above and the dates MAY 6·1910 on the left and MAY 6·1935 on the right, the whole within an ornamental border.

Edge. Plain.

Mr. Gilbert, M.S.A., exhibited a fine solidus of Eugenius (Coh. 6, wt. 69·5).

Mr. L. A. Lawrence, F.S.A., exhibited the new Canadian dollar.

The President read the following letter from the Home Office acknowledging the Society's address of congratulation to His Majesty :

Home Office,
Whitehall.
8th May, 1935.

Sir,

I am directed by the Secretary of State to say that he has been commanded by The King to convey to you His Majesty's thanks for the loyal and dutiful Address from The Royal Numismatic Society on the completion of the Twenty-fifth Year of His Majesty's Reign and to assure you that His Majesty deeply appreciates the sentiments of loyalty and affection to which it gives expression.

I am, Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

(Signed) H. A. STRUTT.

The Honorary Secretary,
The Numismatic Society,
22 Russell Square, W.C. 1.

Mr. H. Herzfelder read a paper on the Cistophori of Hadrian, in which he showed how they could be classed by fabric, and proposed mints for some of them, and suggested that further study would enable more to be attributed in time. (This paper will be printed in the *Numismatic Chronicle*.)

JUNE 20, 1935.

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E., President, in the Chair.

The Minutes of the Annual General Meeting of June 21, 1934, were read and approved.

Messrs. H. Herzfelder and K. R. R. Readhead were appointed scrutineers of the ballot.

Signorina L. Cesano was elected an Honorary Fellow of the Society.

Mr. Derek F. Allen was elected a Fellow of the Society.

The following report was laid before the Society :

The Council have again the honour to lay before you the Annual Report on the state of the Royal Numismatic Society.

It is with deep regret that they have to announce the deaths of the following Fellows :

T. G. Barnett	Rev. S. A. McDowall
George C. Brooke	The Marquis of Sligo
H. Fentiman	Charles A. Watters
William Gillies	

They have also to report the resignation of—

Mrs. George P. Cammann	Col. R. Orbeliani
Carl Edwards, Esq.	Col. G. B. Pears
F. M. Herrick, Esq.	

In addition two names have been removed from the list of Fellows under Rule 15.

On the other hand they have to report the election of the following Honorary Fellow :

Signorina L. Cesano, Rome,
and of the following Fellows :

Derek F. Allen, Esq.	Welborn Owston Smith,
M. Herbert A. Cahn	Esq., M.A.
J. C. S. Rashleigh, Esq.,	M. Louis Strauss
M.A., M.D.	M. Paul Tinchant

Colonel O. Ulrich-Bansa

The number of Fellows is therefore:

	Ordinary.	Honorary.	Total.
June, 1934	221	12	233
Since elected	7	1	8
	<hr/> 228	<hr/> 13	<hr/> 241
Deceased	7	—	7
Resigned	5	—	5
Removed	2	—	2
	<hr/> 214	<hr/> 13	<hr/> 227

The Council have also to announce that they have awarded the Society's medal to Professor Dr. Behrendt Pick, who recently retired from the post of Keeper of the Coin Cabinet and Acting Librarian at Gotha, in recognition of his valuable contributions to ancient, particularly Greek, numismatics.

The Treasurer's Report, which appears on pp. 14-15, was then laid before the Meeting.

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSE-

YEAR ENDING

Dr.

THE SOCIETY IN ACCOUNT WITH

	£	s.	d.
<i>To cost of Numismatic Chronicles (three numbers)</i>	226	6	6
„ <i>Rent</i>	65	0	0
„ <i>Stock of Silver Medals</i>	12	10	0
„ <i>Printing, Postages, and Stationery</i>	11	7	6
„ <i>Refreshments, &c.</i>	5	0	1
„ <i>Insurance</i>	3	15	0
„ <i>Lantern Expenses</i>	6	9	0
„ <i>Book-binding</i>	1	8	6
„ <i>Address to H.M. The King</i>	2	14	6
„ <i>Sundries</i>	8	0	3
	<hr/> £342 11 4		
„ <i>Balance at Bank 31. 5. 35 carried forward—</i>	£	s.	d.
General Account	484	18	8
Research Account	5	0	0
	<hr/> 489 18 8		
	<hr/> £832 10 0		
	<hr/>		

MENTS OF THE ROYAL NUMISMATIC SOCIETY

31ST MAY, 1935.

G. C. HAINES, HON. TREASURER.

Cr.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
<i>By Balance at Bank 31. 5. 34 brought forward—</i>						
General Account	301	6	11			
Research Account	4	10	0			
				305	16	11
„ Entrance Fees	8	8	0			
„ Life Membership Fee	31	10	0			
„ Subscriptions	297	18	6			
				337	11	6
„ Sales of Numismatic Chronicles				141	5	6
„ Dividends and Interest						
£200 5% Conversion Stock 1944-64	10	0	0			
£942 London, Midland and Scottish Railway, 4% Preference Stock (N.B. Market Price 31. 5. 35, £987 8s. 7d.)	37	13	7			
	47	13	7			
Less Income Tax deducted	10	14	7			
				36	19	0
„ Income Tax Recovered						
year ending 5. 4. 35				10	17	1
				£832	10	0

G. C. HAINES, *Hon. Treasurer.*

Audited and found correct,

LEOPOLD G. P. MESSENGER, }
HENRY GARSIDE, } *Hon. Auditors.*

June 14, 1935.

The Reports of the Secretary and Treasurer were adopted on the motion of the President.

The President then handed the Society's medal to Mr. Allan and said:

Geheimrat Dr. Behrendt Pick, who was Director of the Gotha Cabinet from 1893 to 1934 and Honorary Professor of Numismatics in the University of Jena, is well known to many of our Fellows. Though primarily interested in the numismatics of the ancient world, his wide-ranging interest no less than his position in sole charge of so important a general Collection has led him also into the medieval and modern fields. The subject chosen for his earliest work, the nomenclature of the Flavian House (published in successive parts of the *Zeitschrift für Numismatik* from 1885 onwards) already shows him at work in that field where Greek and Roman numismatics mingle, with which we particularly associate his name. In 1898 there appeared from his pen the first part of the first volume of the Berlin Corpus of Ancient Coins covering Dacia and Moesia; and in 1910, in conjunction with another of our Medallists, Dr. Regling, a further part. The completeness of the material collected for this work and the accuracy of the descriptions set a new standard for numismatists. Dr. Pick was entrusted on the death of Dr. Svoronos, in 1923, with the laborious task of completing and seeing through the press the monumental work planned by the latter to provide material for the study of Athenian coinage—*Les Monnaies d'Athènes*. By its publication he has laid all students of this, the most important coinage, historically, of the Greek world, under a permanent obligation.

A large part of his working life has necessarily been taken up with administrative duties, and in this connexion Fellows who have visited the Gotha Cabinet and studied there, or who have been in correspondence with him, will remember his constant kindness and desire to help. But he has also found time to contribute more than a hundred articles, many of great importance, to various learned periodicals—notably studies on the coin-types of Thrace;

on the deities represented on the Greek Imperial coins as holding models of temples; on the Koinon of Armenia; on a forerunner of Mephistopheles on coins of Nicaea, and many others too numerous to mention. Throughout his work we may trace his constant desire to relate numismatics to the wider branches of archaeology, and to history, so that each may illuminate the other. This seems to me the true justification of our studies, and I am most happy to present the medal of our Society to so eminent a numismatist.

Mr. Allan accepted the medal on behalf of Professor Dr. Pick, and read the following translation of a letter of thanks from him.

Gotha,
June 1, 1935.

Dear Mr. Allan,

The resolution of the Royal Numismatic Society to give me its medal has given me great pleasure, and I must thank the Society most heartily. Long ago, in 1899, while I was still a young man, the Society did me the great honour of electing me an Honorary Fellow, and I have always been proud of this. I owed that honour to the publication of the first half volume of the *Corpus Numorum* planned by the Berlin Academy, and the recognition of such a competent authority as your Society strengthened me in the conviction that I had found the right method, and indeed it was retained by my successors without essential alterations and has been applied in other numismatic works also.

It has not been possible for me to devote myself entirely to ancient numismatics. As the sole custodian of a collection so large as that of Gotha, I had to deal with coins and medals of all lands and countries. I have, however, thereby learned a great deal, and many a phenomenon of ancient currency has become clear through the light thrown on it by modern systems, e.g. the many series of ancient commercial currencies, about which I spoke at the Historical Congress in London, 1913. In my later years I have been fond of publishing general observations of a more theoretical kind, about the place of numismatics in historical studies, about the tasks of coin collections and their staffs. Since 1896 I have taught numismatics

at our University of Jena, not to train a few students to be numismatists, but to teach how coins should be used for historical, archaeological, and other research. This is what I call "applied numismatics" in distinction to "pure numismatics": the describing and arranging which is the necessary preliminary. In 1930 I gave up teaching as I had not the time after I had, in 1928, been placed in charge of the Grand Ducal Library also. On June 1, 1935, I retired.

Throughout this time, however, ancient coins remained the main subject of my own researches, as was natural in one who had studied under Mommsen and Droysen, Curtius and Robert, Sallet and Imhof-Blumer. I also early studied the works of the English masters of my subject. Percy Gardner's *Types of Greek Coins* made a great impression on me, and the wonderful series of Catalogues of the British Museum, each finer and fuller than its predecessor, without which ancient numismatics could never have risen to such heights. I have only twice been able to visit the Museum, and for short periods only. But I have often had the pleasure of welcoming English visitors to Gotha. The first were Sir John and Lady Evans, and the last Sir George Hill and Mr. J. W. E. Pearce. I have always corresponded a great deal with the British Museum, and received hundreds of casts from it for my work, and done my best to return similar service to the British Museum and to English numismatists. I am no longer on active service, but I am still ready to help with any information that I can give, and shall be delighted if in this way I can show gratitude for the honour done me.

Yours most sincerely,
Dr. B. PICK.

The President then delivered the following address :

Seven Fellows of the Society have died during this year.

The very great loss which English numismatics sustained by the death of Dr. G. C. Brooke has been dealt with in our *Chronicle*.

Mr. H. Fentiman had been a Fellow of the Society since 1902, and was well known to many of us as a kindly and helpful man.

Mr. William Gillies was a prominent Glasgow solicitor who had been a Fellow of the Society since 1916. He was an active collector, but never attended our Meetings. His collection was sold by Messrs. Glendining last winter.

The Marquess of Sligo, who had been a Fellow of the Society since 1918, was interested in various branches of science and archaeology, but took no active part in the Society's work.

Mr. C. A. Watters, a Liverpool business man who joined the Society in 1901, had at one time an exceedingly fine collection of war medals and decorations and of English coins which was sold by Messrs. Glendining in 1913 and 1917.

Mr. T. G. Barnett only joined the Society in 1931, but he had been known to some of us before that date. A keen antiquary, particularly interested in the discoveries at Viroconium and elsewhere in western Britain, he was always ready to supply information and assist his fellow students. I have personally to thank him for some of that assistance. He left his collection of coins to be divided between the British Museum and the Gloucester Museum.

Rev. S. A. MacDowall, who had been a Fellow of the Society since 1901, was Senior Science Master and Chaplain at Winchester. He was a man of wide interests and the author of a number of works on theology and science. His collection of coins was recently sold by Messrs. Glendining.

The industry of our Fellows as evidenced by the *Chronicle* for the past year has been great. Our authors have travelled over a very wide area, and have made some advance in many branches of our subject.

Let me take first those papers which deal with the Greek series. Dr. A. H. Lloyd read us a paper which had not, at the time these notes were put together, reached actual publication. It is an excellent instance of the close association of numismatics with history, and the assistance which the one study gives to the other. The author found difficulty in accepting the well-known statement of Diogenes Laertius

that Empedocles at his own expense restored health to the town of Selinus by conducting the waters of the river Hypsas into the bed of the river Selinus and so sweeping away the malarial deposit which had there accumulated. An important addition of Selinuntine pieces to the great Lloyd Collection of Greek coins turned the attention of the owner to the series, and he found himself doubting the interpretation which had been placed upon the coin types and the truth of the statement above referred to. Therefore Dr. Lloyd visited the place and made an exhaustive survey of the district. He found, and made clear to us by means of the maps which formed part of the excellent illustrations of the paper, that by reason of the contour of the country an immense engineering feat would be required to effect communication between the two rivers. The connexion could only be made through a cutting perhaps 200 feet in depth, and no trace of such a work could be discovered by the most careful investigation. Also he found grounds for doubting the interpretation of the types of the coins which has been used to support the legend, and pointed out that those types appear on the coins of Selinus at so early a date that they cannot refer to the work of Empedocles, unless it was carried out when he had hardly reached manhood, and, even if his engineering skill was equal to it, his pocket could hardly have been so. Again, he points out that Empedocles was of Akragas, a city generally at issue and often at war with Selinus, and so great a beneficence to a hostile city is unlikely. He suggests an alternative interpretation of the coin types as referring to the alliance with Himera against Agrigentum, and having, as I think, destroyed an ancient belief, he thus provides us with something in its place. He showed us on one of his maps that, if the story of the engineering feat originally referred to Akragas and not to Selinus, there is no obstacle, topographical or otherwise, to its acceptance. The paper is closely reasoned, and when you have seen it in print it will rest with you to decide whether or not you accept it. The transference of a legend from one place to another is, any archaeologist will agree, by no means uncommon,

and Diogenes was telling a story which was even then five hundred years old.

Mr. E. S. G. Robinson has recorded a find of silver coins, mostly of Thasos, which came into his hands, probably intact, and of which a considerable number have been retained by the British Museum. Many of them are rare and some show new varieties. There is no record of the provenance of the hoard, but Mr. Robinson has grounds for attributing it to the Thraco-Macedonian region, and derives from it evidence for the dating of the Thracian series.

M. O. Ravel describes some coins which verify Babelon's attribution of certain gold obols in the French Collection to Corinth, and justify his belief that they are genuine. They represent, therefore, the only known gold coinage of Corinth, and were probably issued in some period of great urgency. There are now five known specimens all from different dies. M. Ravel dates the issue about 460 B.C. He emphasizes the difficulty, which we have all found, of ascertaining the standard weight of small coins, and says: "They vary between wide extremes, and it is very likely that at the time the available scales were not precise enough for small weights; it is also probable that the small coins were not weighed singly, but were cut to the required quantity out of an exact mass of bullion; it did not then matter if one single coin was a little heavier than another." One may perhaps doubt whether it was beyond the capacity of the Greeks to obtain precision in their scales, but I entirely agree with the rest of his explanation, and believe it to be generally applicable to ancient coins of lesser denominations. His paper does not confine itself to these important pieces, but also notes newly discovered specimens from Ambracia and other cities, and, among other useful information, records an experiment in the hubbing of dies.

Roman coinage has again this year been largely dealt with by our Fellows, and the great advance which this branch of our science has made of late has been steadily maintained.

Taking the papers in order of subject we come first to that of the Rev. E. A. Sydenham on the serrated denarii of

the Roman Republic, a subject which has intrigued us all from our numismatic youth upwards. He read this paper to us in March, but it has not yet appeared in print. In 1924 (Part I, p. 52) Mr. Mattingly put forward the view that a large section of the coins was issued by the Marian faction by way of propaganda against the Sullan party, and in assertion of the traditional view of the Roman democrats that the coinage should be kept pure, and he considered that the serration was intended to show that the coins were of good silver. He referred to the strong preference of the German and other tribes for good money. Mr. Sydenham finds considerable difficulty in accepting all Mr. Mattingly's conclusions, and thinks that the coins, whether issued by the Marian party or not, were not struck in the mint of Rome. He attributes some to the south of Italy and others to Spain or south-eastern Gaul. Also he points out that a single notch would suffice to show that the interior of the coin was of good metal and the considerable labour of extensive serration was for that purpose unnecessary, and he draws attention to the existence of other coins which clearly represent a serrated wheel, a solar cult symbol. He thinks, therefore, that the basis of the practice may have been religious, but he agrees that the serrati were struck for circulation outside Italy, favouring Gaul rather than Germany as the principal place of such circulation. I am not entirely satisfied with either of these suggestions. I do not know of other evidence that so powerful a cult as would call for such great issues of coins existed, and was held in such respect in Rome as to induce the central Government of the Republic to order, or at least approve, such issues over a considerable number of years. I agree that the existence of plated serrati, even in considerable numbers, does not negative the conclusions of either author. The forger would be all the more likely to copy a coin which had an especial guarantee of goodness. I am not sure that we can distinguish coins struck at Rome from those issued at provincial mints by the simple rules laid down by Mr. Sydenham, and, indeed, it is by no

means clear that we know what we can certainly attribute to Rome. Some issues have so marked a style that they can certainly be allotted to the provinces, Spain for instance ; but there are many as to which we still must doubt. It would seem that, if the coins in question were struck by the Marian party in protest against the issue of base pieces by their political opponents, the issue must at least have begun at Rome. One can hardly imagine that it commenced after their exile, for it is not a likely measure to be undertaken by a party so powerless as to have lost their hold on the capital, and the issues were too large to have been those of a broken faction. Again, that issues should be made in Spain for use in Spain and Gaul seems probable, but one would hardly suppose that a southern Italian mint would be called upon to supply a special series for circulation beyond the Alps. To whichever opinion I incline I seem to find some difficulty, and cannot as yet see my way further than the acceptance of the view that at least one object of the practice was to indicate fineness.

The early empire was not the subject of much consideration during the year, but Mr. Mattingly showed how well deserved was the title of Trajan, "Optimus Princeps"; and how that great emperor combined autocracy with liberty.

Our valued Austrian contributor, Dr. Pink, brings us again to the consideration of the Arras find and its lessons in his paper on "The Minting of Gold in the Period of Diocletian". In considering it the student must refer to the notes on the Arras Hoard by Sir Arthur Evans in our *Chronicle* for 1930 and "The Aurei and Solidi of the Arras Hoard" by Mrs. Baldwin Brett in that for 1933, as well as Dr. Pink's own paper in the *Numismatische Zeitschrift* in 1931.

Between these three authors there are still differences of opinion. The paper under consideration deals for the most part with the mint-marks of Ticinum and Treviri, and, though it is the fact that a mint-mark can be found in use at one time in more than one mint, I have not found any

instance in the gold series. Where the style of two mints is so distinct that any Roman concerned with coinage would certainly know where a coin was struck, the obvious objection to such a practice was minimized, but here it is suggested that on the establishment of the new mint, first at Iantinum and afterwards at Treviri, the latter place was allotted the mark T, which was well known as of Ticinum, and was constantly in use, at any rate on antoniniani. The antoniniani of Treviri, on the other hand, always used TR, and the style of the bronze coinage of the mint is exactly that of Lugdunum whose third and fourth officinae disappeared, to appear again at Treviri. This reappearance was probably in A.D. 295. Dr. Pink places the issue of aurei a year earlier, and if he is right, I should be inclined to consider that the new mint must have commenced to issue gold before it struck antoniniani. I shall be surprised if this proves to be so. Neither Ticinum nor Lugdunum issued gold freely during the period of Diocletian, but they both struck some coins in that metal. No sign of any bronze issues at Iantinum has been found.

We shall not obtain the true perspective of these questions until they are embodied in a complete history of the Reform of Diocletian, and I suggest that the time for its preparation is now ripe. What was the date of the Reform, if any single date can be attributed to it, where did it commence, and how was the tremendous operation of withdrawing the old coinage from circulation accomplished? No more important monetary operation ever took place in the Roman Empire, and no one can do greater service to our science than the student who effectively solves its problems.

Mr. J. W. E. Pearce has continued his elucidation of the coinage of the later empire by the accurate publication of the contents of two great hoards at Woodbridge and in Dalmatia (in this case assisted by Miss M. E. Wood), and by a paper on the bronze coinage of Valentinian II and Theodosius in which he identifies and points out yet another peculiarity of the coinage which is a valuable contribution to the history of the period, viz. that the Augustus who

actually exercised the imperial power had his obverse legend broken, while the younger and nominal ruler had that legend in unbroken lettering. The original reason for this was that the bust of the greater ruler was larger, and necessarily broke the legend, while the coins of juniors bore smaller busts. The variation was evidently considered of importance, and notwithstanding that an alteration took place in the size of the busts, the practice of division was retained. He also discusses the transference of the mints of Siscia and Thessalonica from the western monetary system to that of the east shortly before A.D. 284. His authority for this rests on the coins alone, and he relies on a number of other exceptional coins for "a complete political map of the post-Maximus settlement of the empire". I look forward to the issue of his complete work on the post-Constantinian period.

Now we come to a question on which at last there is a substantial amount of available evidence, viz. what coinage was provided for Britain after the departure of the Romans. No doubt the existing stock of Roman coins supplied, or partly supplied, the needs of the Province for some years, but certainly it could not have covered the interval with which we have to deal.

Mr. Sutherland's paper on *Radiate Minimi* now in the Ashmolean Museum is very valuable, and is almost the first publication on the subject. The numismatist formerly adopted the legal maxim "*de minimis non curat lex*". I remember a foreign coin dealer handing me a number from a Gallic find, and saying, "Take them away; they bore me!"

In dealing with the coinage of the Gallic Empire it was impossible to leave the irregular coinage unmentioned, and an attempt was made by description of a few specimens to indicate their general character. If Mr. Sutherland knew the pressure as to space under which the author of *R. I. C.*, vol. v, part ii, laboured, he would appreciate one reason why the subject was not further dealt with. The other main reason was that, as he admits, no one knew enough about

them. I agree entirely with his view that the coins comprised in the various hoards which he discusses are not contemporary with their Gallic prototypes. I think it is clear, however, that the earliest specimens of the irregular coinage of Gaul were struck under the Gallic Empire: the large number of them which are in honour of Claudius Gothicus must almost certainly have been struck when his fame was fresh, and their style is similar to those bearing the effigies of Gallic emperors. Also those pieces are found in hoards in which the last regular coins are Gallic.

Mr. Sutherland's table of the progressive degradation of the Pietas type is not only most valuable in itself, but will also form an indication of the methods of moneyers and the changes which may be looked for in other types. I feel very grateful to him for the paper, and even since he wrote several contributions to the records of late, and particularly of the debased, Roman coinage found in England have been made, and are published in our *Chronicle*. To them I will presently refer.

There are notes this year of some thirty finds of coins of various dates of which the greater part were made in England. Mr. Mattingly has recorded the contents of finds at Swaby and Chalfont St. Giles, which, however, comprised only earlier pieces down to, and including, the Antonine period, the latter hoard being unusual in that it included silver and bronze pieces. Site finds from Duston, Bitterne, and Great Chesterton comprised coins from the time of Claudius I to the end of the Roman Empire, including many barbarous pieces, mostly, no doubt, contemporary, or nearly so, with the pieces which they imitated, and of interest as bearing on the question of the issue, the continuance and circulation of what we may call the irregular series. Notes of hoards of barbarous Roman coinage found at Colchester, Icklingham, Duston, and Mere carry us again to the period dealt with by Mr. Sutherland, and the paper in the same number of the *Chronicle* by Mr. Pearce and Miss Wood throws an apt sidelight on it.

Miss A. S. Robertson gave us excellent records of finds at Linwood, of third-century antoniniani, and at St. Mary Cray, of coins from Vespasian to Severus Alexander accompanied by six Legionary denarii of Mark Antony, saved, says the authoress, from demonetization by their baseness. Miss Robertson notes the absence of silver wash on the "Consecratio" coins of Claudius Gothicus, which, of course, arises from the fact that they were issued by irregular mints which did not use the wash. Of Laelian there is but one coin to three of Marius, about the usual proportion. Messrs. O'Neil and Rainbird Clarke gave us such particulars as are available of earlier finds at St. Mary Cray and in Norfolk.

Then comes Mr. Sutherland's account of the Whitechurch Hoard which he considers to be probably a portion of the deposit from which the Ashmolean coins came. The plates are very useful, for the trivial appearance of these pieces had hitherto but rarely attracted the illustrator. Those of us who have no specimens of the coins have studied the subject with difficulty.

For myself, I cannot but accept the view hinted at, if not definitely asserted, by both Messrs. Mattingly and Sutherland, that we must separate the barbarous coins, particularly those found in Britain, into two main classes, the one being almost contemporary with the coins of the Gallic Empire, and extending perhaps to the early Constantinian period, and the other the coinage of the rulers who struggled to hold Britain together after the departure of the legions and power of Rome. It is interesting to see how the desire to assert the solidarity of Britain and Gaul, which we find evidenced under Carausius, still holds even when Britain had ceased to be part of the Roman Empire. I have not, of course, forgotten that there was also a large issue of diademed coins, but the radiate Gallic type had, it would appear, the greater favour, and I think that in this very important section of the coinage of our country we have made a distinct advance in our knowledge.

In April Mr. H. P. Hall exhibited a remarkable collection of contorniates and discussed their probable use, and in

May Mr. Herzfelder discussed the Cistophori of Hadrian in a paper too learned to be dealt with until it appears in print. Its conclusions depend much upon its excellent plates, and I must leave it to my successor.

During the year under review very little has been published with reference to the coinage of our own country in later centuries. Mr. Lawrence discovered a Tealby penny of Henry II with a new mint-name, which he has attributed to Newark-on-Trent. In support of that attribution he gives strong evidence.

Mr. Sutherland has found a second specimen of the rose-marked pound of Queen Elizabeth (which Mr. Mallinson described to us last year) in the Christ Church Collection at Oxford.

Mr. Erik Person of Malmö contributed a note on Saxon coins of Æthelred II and Edward the Confessor found at Torlap in Sweden. There must be much of such information yet to come to us from that country.

Dr. Milne gave us an interesting note on the Harrington farthings, and, with the exception of one other paper which I shall mention later, there is nothing more in our own publication which touches the English series.

We have not, however, neglected the coinage of Europe. Dr. Fairbairn took us out of our ordinary course and introduced us to his fine collection of medals commemorating the various phases of the French Revolution. Their number and variety is extraordinary, and they present a very extensive record of the period. It is remarkable that, in times when stirring and often terrible events followed each other in rapid succession, there should have been a sufficient demand for such things to justify a liberal supply, and to encourage that quaint product of the period, Palloy the Patriot, and others to provide it. Judging from the small artistic merit and the poor mechanical execution of many of the medals, their price must have been small. Those which depict the attempts to bring about a state of popular liberty without entirely dispensing with royalty are touching, and illustrate a phase with which we are perhaps not very

familiar. It might have afforded to an abler king an opportunity of regaining something of his lost authority, but the unfortunate Louis had no merit beyond personal courage, and few wise advisers. Dr. Fairbairn admitted that his subject almost forced him to write as an historian rather than as numismatist, and I find myself drifting in the same direction, and will only say further that I think we all enjoyed his paper and followed him gladly into an unfamiliar path.

M. Majkowski disclosed one of the results of the payment of Danegeld by Æthelred II, which poured an enormous amount of fine English coins into northern Europe, and led to much imitation. So attractive were the English pieces that much of their design was used by continental moneyers, with the result that pieces are found which bear the busts and legends of two totally unconnected rulers, one on each side of the coin. Boleslav the Mighty, who reigned first as Duke and then as King of Poland, from A.D. 992 till 1025, made great use of the English style and types, and his dominions were those most distant from this country in which their influence appears. Boleslav also reigned for a short time in Bohemia, to which country some of the issues in question have been attributed. Our author shows that such attribution is erroneous and, I think, proves conclusively that many of the coins (which he lists and describes with meticulous care) are in fact Polish. Poland was at this time emerging from barbarism, and the finds indicate that before the reign in question the country depended entirely on foreign coins, from Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, England, and, in considerable numbers, from Arabia. Boleslav was probably the first ruler of Poland who issued his own coins, and even he, during a great part of his reign, used dies obtained from other countries. Some of his coins actually bear the bust and inscription of Æthelred, more or less accurately reproduced on their obverse, with the bust and inscription of the Polish ruler on their reverse.

The able pen of M. Dieudonné discussed the origin of the names hardi and liard. He rejected the theory that the

former word was derived from the English word "farthing", and derived it from the warlike figure borne by the coin; referring to the tavern sign of the fighting cock, "Le coq hardi". It is true that the farthing was already an item in the English system, but it was, of course, the smallest coin, not corresponding in size and weight to the hardi, and unless the Guyennese piece can be shown to be the quarter of another important denomination (and M. Dieudonné denies that it can), there seems little probability that its name can be derived from our farthing. The liard appeared in Dauphiné contemporaneously with the hardi and was of the same value, and the derivation of its name is still uncertain.

Mr. Howland Wood writes on the first British coinage issued for the Ionian Islands. He draws attention to the transference of these coins from Haiti, to which they were formerly attributed, to the Ionian Islands, by Paul Lambros in a pamphlet published at Athens in 1884.

Mr. E. S. G. Robinson described an unpublished sterling of Namur found at Salisbury.

The East has not been neglected. Our learned Hon. Secretary has described a number of rare and important oriental coins acquired by the British Museum during the last ten years. First comes an Indo-Greek tetradrachm of Agathocles issued in a series which bears portraits and types of his predecessors. This coin commemorates Demetrius the Unconquered, presumably the father of Agathocles. In the Indo-Greek series is also a rare bronze piece of Apollodotus and some pieces of the Kushans. Then follow descriptions of a number of rare, purely Indian coins from many localities.

Mr. John Walker published for confirmation or criticism a number of Arab-Sassanian coins which he proposes to include in the new British Museum Catalogue of the Umayyad and Abbasid coins which he has in preparation. I concur in his hope that numismatists skilled in this series will accept his invitation and give him material assistance. I speak with much sympathy, remembering a small paper which I published in my early days with the like hope, but

which elicited no response. Mr. Walker's own historical and numismatic notes on the coins are very interesting and carry us into a region which we do not often visit.

In January Mr. Whitehead introduced us to the medal presented by Mir Ja'far to some British officers after the battle of Plassey.

Col. Allotte de la Fuye, whom I have previously had to thank for information freely supplied with reference to another matter, contributes a very useful note on three new dirhems of the Kakwayhids.

South Africa appears this year in our *Chronicle*. Supplementing a paper published in it in 1900,—anonymously, but in fact written by an old friend and constant attendant at our meetings, Sir Augustus Prevost,—Mr. J. T. Becklade has given us a most comprehensive and valuable account of the coinage of the South African Republic. It is very well illustrated, and the two papers form a complete history of the issues of the state which will be of great use to further students and historians.

The coins and medals exhibited at the meetings of the Society during the year were very fine and varied, and we have to present hearty thanks to the exhibitors. Mr. Garside and others kept us well acquainted with contemporary issues.

Of other numismatic publications during the year I have no great number to chronicle. The Oxford University Press and Messrs. Spink & Son, Ltd., have issued for the British Academy another volume of the excellent catalogue of the Lloyd Collection of Greek coins, this time from Velia to Eryx. The plates are, I think, the best that I have ever seen.

Mr. Sydenham has published a work on the "Coinage of Caesarea in Cappadocia", and Mr. H. A. Parsons a useful paper on "The Earliest Coinage of the Isle of Man". Mr. Thorburn is still engaged on the coinage of Persia, and the third volume of the catalogue of coins in the Punjab Museum has been issued. It was compiled by Mr. R. B. Whitehead

and has received a very appreciative notice from that competent authority, our Hon. Secretary.

Dr. Alexander Magnaguti has dealt with the period of Hadrian, as also has Miss Jocelyn Toynbee, in a very good book. Professor Alföldi has published in Rome an important and largely numismatic work on "The Ceremonials of the Empire", and the new publication, *Demareteion*, also largely numismatic, has, under the editorship of M. Jean Babelon, taken the place of the old *Arethuse*.

The enormous hoard of some 100,000 denarii of the second and third centuries found at Reka Devnia has been described by M. Mouchmov, and the numerous coins of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries found at Viminacium by Mr. Erik Gren at Uppsala.

I think I have discharged the onus which was on me, but, at the risk of wearying you, I should like to add a few more words.

When I had the honour of addressing you as your President for the first time, now five years ago, I ventured to submit to you a thesis "That this Society and its Fellows are doing useful work". I believe that I then fully substantiated my proposition, and I think if we look back over the intervening years we shall feel that it is even more true to-day. I by no means desire to claim all merit for recent numismatic research for our Society or our country. Excellent work has been done abroad, but we in our publications and elsewhere have done our fair share. Let me also say that Professor Alföldi and Dr. Karl Pink have done so much work through our *Chronicle*, and in correspondence with our Fellows, that I can hardly consider them as outside our circle.

Consider first what addition has been made to our knowledge of the coinage of our own country. Excellent histories thereof, published by Sir Charles Oman and Dr. Brooke, now place at our disposal a complete survey of the coinage as it is known as the result of modern study. There was great room for such books, and they are of the first importance.

Mr. L. A. Lawrence has also done much and elucidated many points. One may particularly refer to comprehensive papers on the coinage of the reign of Edward III.

Miss Farquhar's papers on Thomas Simon and the Forlorn Hope Medal have contributed much to our knowledge of a very important period.

Messrs. Blunt, Mallinson, C. C. Oman, Wells, and others have also contributed useful papers, and Dr. Brooke's paper on the origin and distribution of early types of gold coins in Britain was, to my mind, extraordinarily informative.

Many finds have been competently described, and indeed the accurate recording of finds is a branch of our science in which a very marked advance has been made both here and abroad.

The coinages of India and the East also fall to us for treatment, and the works of Messrs. Allan, Nelson Wright, Whitehead, and others have supported that burden.

I would also have you turn, and turn with justifiable pride, to the work which has been done in Roman Numismatics. Let us follow it through.

Mr. Sydenham has published a very convenient summary of his knowledge of the cast coinage of Rome, and Messrs. Mattingly and Robinson have dispersed the errors of our predecessors and arranged the Romano-Campanian and Roman pre-imperial series in what I believe to be correct chronological order. Mr. Sydenham has joined with Mr. Mattingly in the elucidation of many minor points and difficulties, particularly in the Republican period.

Messrs. Mattingly and Sydenham have also dealt most exhaustively with the earlier period of the Empire in their great work on Roman Imperial Coinage, and have placed in the hands of students and collectors a reasoned and detailed history and catalogue; I may say, with regard to the earlier reigns, a Corpus. One volume is as yet required to carry their work down to the Reform of Diocletian, and we hope to see it soon.

To the history of the next years Sir Arthur Evans, Mrs. Baldwin Brett, and Dr. Pink have contributed a

discussion on the lessons to be drawn from the great Arras find; and an immense amount of information to lead to a history of the later Imperial Coinage has been accumulated and published by Mr. Pearce, Mr. Salisbury, and others who have opened our eyes to the great interest of a period which had been neglected in England.

The Constantinian period has not been neglected, but requires further comprehensive treatment.

The greater part of Mr. Hugh Goodacre's history of the Byzantine Coinage was published before the years with which I am dealing, but he is still at work, and has placed at our disposal an account of the Byzantine period which is of the greatest value and most convenient for reference.

Dr. Milne has completed his series of papers on the leaden coinage of Roman Egypt.

Sir Charles Oman, Sir George Macdonald, M. Jules Maurice, Messrs. Baldwin, Glen Taylor, Messenger, O'Neil, and others have also supplied much information, particularly as to hoards of Roman coins in England and Scotland.

Thus you will see that in these few years almost the whole of the coinage of Rome has been dealt with, and our successors have a record which in its main outlines is something like complete, and in matters of detail has reached a very high development. They will be spared many of our early doubts and difficulties, and enabled to carry our science on over the wide fields which still lie between us and finality. My claim may rest chiefly on the progress which has been made in these three great series, but much other work has been done.

May I express my deep satisfaction at having been permitted to serve you as President during a period marked by so great an advance in knowledge, and my great pride in the Royal Numismatic Society.

Dr. Fairbairn proposed, and Mr. Garside seconded, a vote of thanks to the President for his address, and for his five years' service to the Society as President.

The result of the Ballot for office bearers for 1935-6 was announced as follows:

President.

SIR GEORGE MACDONALD, K.C.B., M.A., LL.D., D.LITT.,
F.B.A.

Vice-Presidents.

PROFESSOR SIR CHARLES OMAN, K.B.E., M.P., M.A., D.C.L.,
LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A.

PERCY H. WEBB, Esq., M.B.E.

Treasurer.

G. C. HAINES, Esq., F.S.A.

Secretaries.

JOHN ALLAN, Esq., M.A., F.S.A.

HAROLD MATTINGLY, Esq., M.A.

Foreign Secretary.

V. B. CROWTHER-BEYNON, Esq., M.A., F.S.A.

Librarian.

FREDERICK A. HARRISON, Esq., F.Z.S.

Members of the Council.

LADY EVANS, M.A. (Oxon. and Dubl.).

HENRY GARSIDE, Esq.

WILLIAM GILBERT, Esq., M.S.A.

HENRY PLATT HALL, Esq.

L. A. LAWRENCE, Esq., F.R.C.S., F.S.A.

R. C. LOCKETT, Esq., F.S.A.

B. H. ST. J. O'NEIL, Esq., M.A., F.S.A.

REV. E. A. SYDENHAM, M.A.

JOHN WALKER, Esq., M.A., M.R.A.S.

R. B. WHITEHEAD, Esq., M.A., F.A.S.B., M.R.A.S.

The President proposed a vote of thanks to the Auditors, Scrutineers, Secretaries, Librarian, and Treasurer, and adjourned the Society till October 17.

XII.

SILIQUEA ISSUES AT TREVERI FROM THE DEATH OF VALENS TO THE ACCESSION OF MAGNUS MAXIMUS.

[SEE PLATES X-XII.]

IN a former paper (*Num. Chron.*, 1932, pp. 245-73) on the course of the VRBS ROMA issues at Treveri I attempted to show (1) that certain slight but quite definite reverse *differentiae* could be dated as earlier or later according as they were found, or not found, on coins of Valentinian I, who died while the issue of the "Throne" type was in progress; (2) that the later varieties, again, are approximately datable by the changing portraiture, the latest portraits presumably being those which, comparatively scarce with the "Throne" type, are found almost without exception throughout the succeeding "Cuirass" type issue. Incidentally, we were able to arrive at a relative dating for the rare VOT X MVLT XV coins of Valens and Gratian by means of obverse identities of both with the latest portraits of the "Throne" type.

The present notes are a continuation of the earlier paper. But owing to the peculiar differentiation of types which seems to have been adopted by Gratian after the death of Valens in August 378 (see p. 141) it is not easy to find either reverse identities linking contemporaneous portraits of the co-regents in the same type or obverse identities linking contemporaneous issues of the different types. Still, as the differentiation

was watertight only in the case of Valentinian II's **VICTORIA AVGGG**, a few identities reward a search, although the absence of a definite boundary-line between earlier and later, such as we had before in the death of Valentinian I, leaves their precise position within our period doubtful.

In one point, however, precision is very necessary. Maximus continued without break two of Gratian's *siliqua*-types **CONCORDIA AVGGG** and **VIRTUS ROMANORVM**. Both are found struck in the name of Theodosius, and it is at least of some historical importance for us to determine whether by Gratian or Maximus or both. Gratian had placed him on the throne, Maximus claimed his complicity in the plot which led to Gratian's overthrow and murder. Reverse identities show that the latter of the two types was struck for Theodosius by both Gratian and Maximus; for the much rarer **CONCORDIA** type similar proof is so far lacking, though it will almost certainly be found. But proof of equal cogency is supplied by the strange practice of "substitution of portrait" which marks the mint-procedure of the time. The Theodosius of Pl. XI. 7 is a "Gratian", the Theodosius of Pl. XI. 15, 18, 20 a "Maximus".

Substitution of Portrait.

As Regling notes in his article *Münzwesen* in Pauly-Wissowa's *Real-Encyclopädie*, from Diocletian onward certainty that an Emperor's portrait on his coins represents his real features gradually disappears. At the time of our present period the portrait of an Emperor varies not only between mint and mint but at the same mint and in the same issue. Abundant proof of this was

given in the illustrations to the VRBS ROMA paper mentioned above. Especially instructive is a comparison of the two portraits of Gratian (*l. c.* Pl. XIX. 8, 15) with those of Valens (*ibid.*, 20, 23). Here we have two different portraits, both new to the issue, used impartially for both Emperors. There can be no doubt, I think, that the "Curls" portrait of 15 and 23 was designed for Gratian, and if it suggests the archer-god *crinitus Apollo*, the artist perhaps was only indulging a fancy which was in the mind of Ausonius when in Epigram 6 he extols Gratian's skill with the bow and in Epigram 7 makes his happy mother wonder whether she has indeed given birth to a god. This portrait, rare in the VRBS ROMA "Throne" type issue (but hardly more rare for Valens than for Gratian) is adopted in subsequent issues to the end of his reign as peculiarly Gratian's own, although given occasionally to Valens and on one specimen, as we have seen, to Theodosius. The other portrait (with variations of expression from genial to severe, apparently marking different hands following the same general model) is by far the commonest for Valens towards the end of the "Throne" type issue and so must be regarded as his own, although given occasionally to Gratian.

It would seem that an artist could represent an Emperor under any ideal form he chose, that from time to time different models found special favour and were copied more or less closely by various hands, and that a mint-group of artificers, normally employed in striking for him, when called upon exceptionally to strike in the name of his co-regents, still followed the model to which they were accustomed.

Bearing in mind the statement of Dr. Pink in his

recent article in the *Numismatic Chronicle* (1934, p. 111) that "in questions of style it is always difficult to convince any one", I am conscious that many of my "portrait substitutions" may be challenged, but many are beyond dispute and by proving the existence of the custom add a degree of probability to the less obvious instances. Clearly we have here a useful aid to the numismatist for relative dating, especially as, owing to the prevalent differentiation of types at this period, die-identities cannot be readily found.

Siliqua-types A.D. 378-383.

1. PERPETVETAS "Phoenix on globe". While extremely rare, this is found for all three Emperors, Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosius.

2. *Vota*-coins. VOT V MVL T X $\overline{\text{TRP}}\overline{\text{S}}$ is found with reverse identity for Valentinian II and Theodosius; VOT XV MVL T XX $\overline{\text{TRP}}\overline{\text{S}}$ for Gratian; VOT X MVL TIS XV $\overline{\text{TR}}$ with reverse identity for Gratian and Theodosius, and VOT XV MVL TIS XX $\overline{\text{TR}}$ for Gratian. These coins, again, are extremely rare but are found for all Emperors, though only the first series is, up to now, complete. The second series must have included Valentinian II to whom alone the *vota* can apply.

These issues were discussed in my former paper (*l. c.* pp. 267-73) and illustrated on Pl. XX, 8-20. I now add from a cast kindly supplied to me from Berlin the *Perpetuetas* portrait of Valentinian II [Pl. X, 13].

3. The continuation after Valens' death of VRBS ROMA "Cuirass" type is proved not only by the preponderating numbers for Gratian but also by the

inclusion of Theodosius. I now add to my previous illustrations his (?) unique coin of this issue from a cast kindly sent to me from Vienna [Pl. XI. 6] as well as three further specimens of Valentinian II's rare coins [Pl. X. 14-16]. This type, in fact, is—after the death of Valens—virtually differentiated to Gratian.

4. **VIRTVS ROMANORVM** "Rome seated on throne" follows **VRBS ROMA** with still stricter limitation to Gratian. Valentinian II is not represented in this issue and Theodosius only very rarely. Each had his own exclusive type.

Maximus, who introduced no fresh *siliqua* type at Treveri, continued Gratian's issue without a break but with slightly less strict limitation to himself. The majority of Theodosius' scarce coins of this type were struck by Maximus.

5. **VICTORIA AVGGG** "Victory advancing left" is, indeed, more strictly differentiated than any other type, being confined in *AR* to Valentinian II alone.

6. **CONCORDIA AVGGG** "Constantinople seated on throne" is, of course, both by legend and type specially appropriate for Theodosius, in whose name it was struck by both Gratian and Maximus. The coin of Gratian illustrated by kind permission of Sir Arthur Evans is—so far as my experience goes—unique [Pl. X. 3]. I have seen eight of Maximus, but four of these seem to be struck from the same dies. The coin does not occur for Valentinian II.

A similar differentiation of types in *AR* seems to have been practised at Lugdunum. Both the **VRBS ROMA** and the **VIRTVS ROMANORVM** of this period have been seen by me in rather scarce examples for Gratian only; **VICTORIA AVGGG** still more rarely for

Valentinian II only. The (?) unique **CONCORDIA AVGGG LVGPS** in Sir Arthur Evans's collection is, however, a coin of Gratian; but at Lyons there is a (?) unique **Æ 3 LVGP** of Theodosius with the *Æ* type (i.e. "holding cornucopiae"). Probably his appropriate *siliqua* will one day reward a search. Arelate was not striking in *Æ* at this time. Aquileia seems, at least at first, to follow Treveri.

No satisfactory notion of this coinage can be gained from Cohen. Some of the *vota*-coins were not known to him, and even if he had known of them, in a bare list they would have failed of their meaning. The X-XV of Theodosius in the British Museum could not possibly have been referred to this period except for its reverse identity with the coin of Gratian at Vienna (the *vota* suit neither, but only Valentinian II, whose coin has not yet been found), and the V-X of Valentinian II in Sir Arthur Evans's collection would naturally (although not necessarily) have been assumed to be earlier and, probably, issued to accompany the **VOT X MVLTV TRPS** of Valens and Gratian, except for its identity of reverse with the coin of Theodosius at Paris. The **VRBS ROMA** type is given by Cohen to Valentinian II without IVN, thus restricting him to the very similar issue of his post-Maximus restoration. That Theodosius shared in Gratian's issue also is provable only by careful inspection of his "unique" Vienna coin, as the two issues lend themselves to identical description. Lastly, the prices set against the coins by Cohen are often very misleading as indications of their comparative rarity; Maximus, for example, is overrated in the types which he has in common with Gratian.

I. *Portraiture of this period.*

(a) Gratian [Pl. X. 1-12].

During the whole of this period the "authorized version" of Gratian's portrait seems to be that which shows him with curls. This is seen at its best on its first appearance in his VOT X MVLT XV TRPS coins and in the contemporary portion of the VRBS ROMA "Throne"-type issue, but even before the end of the latter type we meet with weak and less pleasing variations. This "Curls" portrait persists with the rarest exceptions throughout the following "Cuirass"-type issue. A typical example was illustrated l. c. Pl. XX. 1; but many uncouth variations occur, especially with the m.m. TRPS, in which, however, although the comely features are caricatured, the curls are always more or less clearly indicated. Evidently several hands with varying degrees of skill are copying a model, the general characteristics of which, viz. handsome features and flowing locks, from their uniform adoption for Gratian's portrait in the A coinage throughout the Empire, must have been laid down in government orders to the several mints.

When the VIRTVS ROMANORVM type succeeded VRBS ROMA at Treveri there was no change in the portrait, though among many instances of the closest similarity in the portraiture of the two issues I have as yet come across no actual identity. But apparently not long after the change of reverse type, a striking modification (so, at least, it appears to me) occurs in the presentment of Gratian's portrait by a group of the mint-artificers. I see a strong contrast between the Gratian of Pl. X. 1 (which I will call "Curls 1") and

the Gratian of **Pl. X. 2, 3, 4** (which I will call "Curls 2"). The former is the typical Gratian of the **VRBS ROMA** "Cuirass"-type issue—handsome, dignified, and serene. The latter is more lively, sometimes with a Puckish or even Mephistophelean expression, and with a less formal arrangement of the curls. The two varieties seem to occur in about equal numbers, but perhaps only the second lasted to the end of Gratian's reign.

While I regard these portraits as Gratian's own, those of **Pl. X. 5-12** seem to be quite un-Gratian. Nos. 5-8 have, however, the typical Gratian curls, which at Treveri are never, I believe, given to either Valentinian II or Theodosius in what I consider to be their "own" portraits; Theodosius has them only in the extreme instance of substitution shown in the Vienna coin [**Pl. XI. 7**]. But nos. 9-12 lack the curls, and nothing but the legend could persuade us that they represent Gratian. I suggest the possibility—which at least introduces some degree of order into this chaos of portraits—that they were produced by artists who were normally engaged in striking for his colleagues. Most of the unusual portraits are very scarce.

No. 5 shows a peculiar treatment of the drapery to the right of the coin. The outermost line runs inwards towards the neck, whereas all Gratian's other coins make it end outwards in a curve suggesting the left shoulder. No. 12 shows this curve with unusually exaggerated distinctness, but it is so intended on all Treveran coins—except just those which have this portrait. If we look at **Pl. X. 18**, we see a similar treatment of the drapery, and, I think, a sufficiently similar portrait to allow us to entertain the possibility of a borrowing from Valentinian II. A further com-

parison with Valentinian's commonest *A* portrait [Pl. XII. 12, 13] leaves, I think, no room for doubt. On the *siliquae* also this portrait is rather common for Valentinian.

The unprepossessing portraits of nos. 6, 7, 9, 10 are possibly derived from another model designed for Valentinian. Compare his portrait of Pl. X. 19 which has reverse identity with that of 18, discussed above. This also is rather common for him, but I have not seen it on his gold coinage. I have met with it for Theodosius on his coins struck by Gratian only with the very rare Æ 3 **CONCORDIA AVGGG** type. But the Theodosius of Pl. XI. 17 and the Maximus of Pl. XII. 5, which are linked by reverse identity, have a somewhat similar portrait, and I believe that the typical "Large nose" portrait of Maximus, his commonest by far, is only the ultimate development of this.

Pl. X. 11 illustrates a portrait, unusual—in my experience—on Gratian's coinage, but which is found quite commonly for Maximus. The arrangement of the hair just above the neck in two or more orderly masses, each outlined distinctly, and the general similarity of features seem to me to show the connexion. The reverse of the coin points to a latish period in the development of the type (see p. 157) and the portrait—possibly designed for Theodosius—may have come in late in the reign.

Pl. X. 12 has reverse identity with the Theodosius of Pl. XI. 16. There are several portraits—particularly of Maximus—which, while showing little or no similarity of features, agree in a small, neat bust marked by extra attention to the drapery of the left shoulder and arm. The little curve to the right is generally

filled in by two or three lines. This portrait seems to belong to that class. Compare the Maximus of **PI. XII. 8** and the Theodosius of **PI. XI. 19**. Lastly, with the portrait of **PI. X. 8** compare that of Valentinian [**PI. XI. 5**]; perhaps it is Theodosian in origin. I myself am of opinion that the three main types of Maximus' portraits were already in use under Gratian and were continued by the unchanged *personnel* of the mints for his successor. Gratian's "own" portraits with curls seem to have been carefully avoided for Maximus, as we might expect. But that they were still in use for Gratian at the end of his reign seems likely from the point of development reached in the reverse types found with them.

(b) Valentinian II [**PI. X. 13-XI. 5, XII. 11-14.**]

As Valentinian's **AR VICTORIA AVGGG** is not shared with his co-regents nor their types, after **VRBS ROMA**, shared with him, we can have no reverse identity linking his earlier portrait with Valens or his later with Theodosius, and the virtually unchanging reverse type itself offers no clue for relative dating. His rare **VRBS ROMA** coins may have been struck before or after the death of Valens; in either case they give us comparatively early portraits, as they are prior to the issue of **VIRTVS ROMANORVM**. His still rarer portraits in the *Vota* and **PERPETVETAS** issues must help to date them rather than be dated by them. His only certain portrait earlier than our present period must be looked for on the gold coins in which he is associated with Valens and not with Theodosius.

Premising that in seeing resemblances in portraits

judgements may differ and that I am quite prepared for disagreement with my view, I still think the portraits have an interest in themselves, apart from any conclusions one may try to draw from them. They are certainly varied and have been brought together from many sources.

Some seem to me to be based on portraits of Gratian (none, so far as I have noticed, on those of Theodosius, unless Pl. XI. 5 be one), while the very varied majority, seen only, or mainly, for Valentinian himself, I regard as his "own".

For his "Gratian" portraits, compare Pl. XI. 2, 3, 4 with Pl. X. 1, 2, 4 respectively. Probably the portrait of Pl. X. 15, 17, which seems to be a meeting-point for the VRBS ROMA and the VICTORIA AVGGG issues, is also "Gratian". Perhaps the same model was followed on the *Vota* coin (*Num. Chron.*, l. c., Pl. XX. 16), though the different treatment of the drapery of the left arm suggests a different hand.

Of Valentinian II's "own" portraits the earliest must be that which, sometimes very small, but varying in size, is seen in the first issue of the *solidus* VICTORIA AVGG [Pl. XII. 11] shared by him with Valens. The *obv.* busts have pearl-diadem, and the two emperors of the reverse are equal in size and have their l. leg bare. I have not yet seen this portrait on his *siliquae*.

The second of his "own" portraits [Pl. X. 18] is also found, though rarely, with the above gold issue [Pl. XII. 12], but is his typical, and, I believe, universal portrait in the succeeding gold issue [Pl. XII. 13], in which the Emperors are unequal in size and have both legs completely draped by their imperial mantles.

This issue goes on for Theodosius, but on his coins the Emperors are represented equal. He has more coins than Valens, and so one may suppose that those of Valentinian II were mostly struck with him rather than with Valens, although there is this difference in the reverse type. In this conventional two-Emperor type, retained when three or more Emperors were actually reigning, it is clear that one figure must always typify the senior Emperor and natural that the other should typify the colleague in whose name the coin was struck. But, as we have seen in the earlier issue, the boy-Emperor could be disregarded.

In this portrait the features are generally unmistakable, but it is also marked off from all others by the distinctive rendering of the drapery, which shows no outer line for the curve over the left shoulder. It is early, as it occurs in the first gold issue and is seen with **VRBS ROMA** (*Num. Chron.*, l. c., Pl. XX. 2), **PERPETVETAS** [Pl. X. 13] and **VICTORIA AVGGG** [Pl. X. 18], with which latter type it is quite common. A comparison of the *Vota* and **PERPETVETAS** portraits, which were discussed and illustrated in my former paper, shows the closest resemblance in the case of those of Gratian and Theodosius, which suggests their contemporaneousness. The two very dissimilar portraits of Valentinian II must also, then, be contemporaneous.

Yet another variety of Valentinian II's "own" portraits is linked with the last by reverse identity [Pl. X. 19]. It is the least attractive, is fairly common, and perhaps gave rise to the ugly portraits of Gratian [Pl. X. 6, 7, 9, 10]. I have never seen it on gold for

any Emperor, but it occurs for Theodosius in the Æ 3 **CONCORDIA AVGGG** and for Valentinian II in the Æ 2 **REPARATIO REIPVB** among other portraits [Pl. XII. 14].

Other portraits, such as Pl. X. 16 and XI. 5, occur sporadically.

(c) Theodosius [Pl. XI. 6–XII. 1, 15].

By far the commonest portrait on his *siliquae* is that illustrated in Pl. XI. 9, 11–13. I have not seen it for either of his co-regents except on one **VRBS ROMA** of Gratian in Sir Arthur Evans's collection. It is the portrait of his **VOT X MVLTVS XV TR** (*Num. Chron.*, l. c., Pl. XX. 19) but not of his **VOT V MVLTVS TRPS** and **PERPETVETAS TRPS** (*ibid.*, Pl. XX. 17, 22) which seem to be earlier. It seems to be his "own" portrait, but perhaps was not adopted at the beginning of his reign. His single specimen of **VRBS ROMA** [Pl. XI. 6] more resembles Gratian's "Curls 1" type, without the curls; and Gratian's "Curls 2" portrait, curls and all, is seen for him in Pl. XI. 7. With this latter are connected by similarity of reverse detail (see p. 162) nos. 8 and 10, which have reverse identity with each other. Another portrait, which, although decidedly neither "Gratian" nor Theodosius' "own", is referable to Gratian's reign, is the rather parrot-like one of Pl. XI. 16. This is linked by reverse identity with the Gratian of Pl. X. 12, which shows the distinctive treatment of the drapery characteristic of the "small, neat bust" variety. Gratian also has this rather "parrot-like" portrait, but with curls, and with him it is linked by reverse identity with his other

"non-Gratian" portrait of Pl. X. 5. It does not seem to be typical of any Emperor and was probably produced by an inferior artist aiming at Gratian's model but succeeding only with the curls.

A later set of portraits connects Theodosius with Maximus. Pl. XI. 15, 18, 20 are indistinguishable from coins of Maximus except in the name. Pl. XI. 17 is a less typical portrait, but has reverse identity with Pl. XII. 5 of Maximus. This little group of coins in itself furnishes complete evidence of the interchange of portrait with which I introduced these notes. The Theodosius of Pl. XI. 18 has reverse identity (which unfortunately I cannot show at the moment) with a Maximus of Pl. XII. 2 type, while by the reverse identity of Pl. XI. 19, 20 the "Nose" portrait and the "small, neat bust" are similarly linked.

The gold of Theodosius at Treveri seems, so far as I have noticed, to give him always a rather conventional portrait with regular features of a more or less unvarying type. There is no hint of the rich diversity of his *siliquae* portraits. On the other hand, his bronze, rare though it is, shows almost as surprising a variety—except, of course, for the "Maximus" portrait—as the *siliquae*.

(d) Magnus Maximus [Pl. XII. 2-9, 16].

Any one who contrasts Maximus' gold and silver at Treveri, or his *siliquae* at Treveri and Mediolanum, must see, I think, that the artists responsible for the portraits are severally following a model to which they are accustomed, without regard to the actual features of a particular Emperor. I have suggested above that

the three commonest *siliquae* portraits of Maximus at Treveri may be seen in embryo in the three non-Gratian portraits of Gratian [Pl. X. 10-12], which show neither his characteristic features nor his curls, and may have originated in his colleagues' *officinae*. Anyhow, even if I am right, they receive under Maximus a development which stamps them unmistakably as his, whose-soever name accompanies them.

(1) Most typical is the portrait in which the nose is as characteristic a feature as it was of the Duke of Wellington. It can be very dignified, but, of course, the step from sublime to ridiculous was here an easy one for an inferior artist to take, and involuntary caricatures are common. Examples of this portrait are shown in Pl. XII. 4, 7 and perhaps 5; still better examples are the "Theodosius" of Pl. XI. 15, 18, 20. The coins of Maximus himself are here all chosen for the sake of their reverse identities and not primarily for the portrait.

(2) A quite common portrait is that of Pl. XII. 2, 3, 6, 9. The features are regular, and although they vary somewhat in other examples, the distinctive careful treatment of the hair (see p. 145) is always observed. For convenience of reference I will call this portrait "Regular" in contrast to the "Nose" portrait of (1). The two portraits are linked as in contemporaneous use by reverse identities both in the **CONCORDIA AVGGG** and the **VIRTUS ROMANORVM** series. If to my present illustrations we add Lord Rayleigh's coin from *Num. Chron.*, 1933, Pl. XVI. 36 (the obverse is identical with my present Pl. XII. 4, and the reverse with Pl. XII. 2), we have a double link between the two portraits, for Pl. XII. 3 and 4 have also reverse

identity.¹ Maximus' *Concordia* type is very rare; his *Virtus* type is very common and furnishes several identities, of which I give one in PL. XII. 6 and 7.

(3) I group under this third heading a number of portraits with the "small neat bust" spoken of above. They seem mostly to represent Maximus with a lively and genial expression and a youthful appearance. Except in many of the latter which are obviously from the same hand or following the same model, there is no connecting bond of similarity of feature, and they are grouped together mainly as differing from (1) and (2). However, they will always, I think, be found to add a little extra detail to the drapery by means of lines filling up the curve over the left shoulder. PL. XII. 8 shows this, with reverse identity linking it with (2) [PL. XII. 9]; there are others linking it with (1). The three portraits were, then, in simultaneous use. Perhaps "Youthful" will best comprise the portraits of this third group under a common name.

II. *Reverse types of this period.*

Vota coins and PERPETVETAS: struck for all three Emperors [PL. X. 13, and *Num. Chron.*, 1932, Pl. XX. 15-22].

These exceedingly rare coins have already been discussed; see p. 140. The portraits of Gratian in both issues with mint-mark TRPS are closely alike and would suit the earlier part of our period; those of Theodosius are also alike, but unlike any others I have seen. This may suggest an early portrait soon abandoned. The similarity of portraiture marks the two

¹ This is the only instance known to me of the personified Constantinople having her head looking left.

issues as fairly contemporaneous. The two portraits of Valentinian II, however, are widely different, but both occur together on his earlier VRBS ROMA as well as on his VICTORIA AVGGG coins, and the interchange causes no difficulty at this period.

The *Vota* coins with mint-mark $\overline{\text{TR}}$ show a Gratian that might be equally early, but a Theodosius with the portrait which we may regard as his normal one in its final crystallized form and therefore presumably later. But as it is found with Gratian's name on an VRBS ROMA in Sir Arthur Evans's collection, it would still come into the earlier part of the period. Valentinian's coin of this series is still to seek.

All these coins seem to fall—most of them considerably—below the normal 1.9 gm. standard of the *siliqua*. Weights (some taken from v. Koblitz) are: for PERPETVETAS 1.35, 1.55, 1.6, 1.71; for the *Vota* coins: $\overline{\text{TRPS}}$ 1.36, 1.81, $\overline{\text{TR}}$ 1.54, 1.69 gm.

Differentiated types.

Gratian's type: VRBS ROMA (Rome seated on cuirass) [Pl. X. 14-16, and *Num. Chron.*, 1932, Pl. XIX. 26-34, XX. 12].

This has already been discussed (*Num. Chron.*, 1932, *l.c.*). We saw that with mint-mark TRPS• Valens and Gratian were pretty evenly represented. There are none of Valentinian II. With mint-mark TRPS I now possess 6 of Valens, 21 of Gratian, or, reckoning casts and rubbings, 11 of Valens, 38 of Gratian. It seems clear that the issue went on for some time after Valens' death. Of Valentinian II and Theodosius I have none, but by the kindness of the keepers of various museums

and of private collectors, I have casts of 5 of Valentinian, and 1 of Theodosius. My own coins must give a rough idea of the proportionate output for the various Emperors, and the issue must have been after Valens' death practically restricted to Gratian, the others having each his own similarly restricted type.

At what date was **VRBS ROMA** superseded by **VIRTUS ROMANORVM**? It is an attractive suggestion that the disappearance in the new type of the figure of Victory from the globe held by Roma coincides with Gratian's removal of the statue of Victory from the Senate House in 382. But this would give us only one year for the (apparently) much larger issue. I know of 93 **VIRTUS ROMANORVM** of Gratian. Assuming that until Valens' death Gratian struck equal numbers for him and for himself, and that afterwards the issue of silver went on at a uniform rate till the end of his reign, we should have (on the basis of my records) 27 **VRBS ROMA** and 93 **VIRTUS ROMANORVM** to represent the output of five years. On this calculation the change must have come before the end of 379. This is very hypothetical, but is to some extent supported by the portraiture. Gratian's "Curls 2" portrait has not yet been evolved. The new specimens of Valentinian II [Pl. X. 14, 15], if, as I think, they are Gratian in character, are borrowed from the earlier "Curls 1" model. No. 15 has the "Acute-angle" reverse variety which I thought (*Num. Chron.*, 1932, p. 263) had been entirely superseded by the "Brush" variety some time before the end of the issue. But the obverse seems to be contemporaneous with that of **VICTORIA AVGGG** [Pl. X. 17], which must, I think, be dated after Valens.

Gratian's type: VIRTUS ROMANORVM

[Pl. X. 1, 2, 4-12; XI. 16; XII. 1].

Continued by Maximus.

Some of the portraits of this issue are so extremely similar to some of the preceding, that the two issues must be regarded as continuous. The closest similarities occur, with a variety of reverse which we should also be inclined to place earliest on the score of greatest dissimilarity with the final form into which the type crystallized under Maximus. Out of 238 coins of Maximus that I have seen, the reverse details can be determined in 195. His two main varieties are:

- A. Lines of dress just below waist are vertical. The dress is carried up over r. arm; e.g. Pl. XII. 5.
- B. Lines of dress just below waist run from side to side, often V-shaped. Hanging over l. shoulder is a V-shaped flap; e.g. Pl. XII. 6.

Of the 195 coins of Maximus, there are 102 A and 55 B. We may call these his regular varieties. Irregular (i.e. for Maximus) would be:

- A. But (a) with absence of "dress over arm"; e.g. Pl. X. 6; (b) with presence of flap (noted only for Victor); (c) With both (a) and (b); e.g. Pl. X. 7.
- B. But (a) with absence of flap; e.g. Pl. X. 8; (b) with presence of "dress over arm"; e.g. Pl. X. 5; (c) with both (a) and (b); e.g. Pl. X. 1.

Of the 38 "irregularities" of Maximus, 23 are A (a) i.e. the dress generally reaches to the arm but does not fall across it, 13 are A (c), i.e. without the "dress over arm" and with the flap falling over the l. shoulder. The remaining two are one A (b) on Victor's coin and one B (a).

Turning now to the 93 coins that I have seen of Gratian, of which we can determine the reverse details of about 80, we find :

I. With the earlier "Curls 1" portrait :

(1) 20 B (c), all showing the wide throne of **Pl. X. 1**.

(2) 8 B (a), seven have wide throne.

(3) 2 A (a), the throne is still of the wide, as opposed to the later and neater type. Obverse identity links (3) with (2).

(4) 5 A, two have wide throne, one of the other three has m.m. **TRP**.

II. With the later "Curls 2" portrait :

(1) 4 B (c), only one has wide throne.

(2) 5 B (a), four with wide throne.

(3) 9 A (a), some showing the wider and clumsier type of throne, some the later and neater; one of these [**Pl. X. 4**] closely resembles a coin of Maximus.

(4) 14 A, all of the narrower type [**Pl. X. 2**]. These are linked with **CONCORDIA AVGGG** by the obverse identity of **Pl. X. 2** and 3.

(5) 4 B. These have a very close resemblance to coins of Maximus, e.g. **Pl. XII. 6**.

From this it would appear that the issue started with "Curls 1" and went on for some time before "Curls 2" came in, that the two portraits were in use together for a while, "Curls 1" being then discontinued and "Curls 2" lasting to the end of the issue.

The reverses begin entirely with the "irregularities", which, by far the more frequent with "Curls 1", make way with "Curls 2" for varieties which under Maximus established themselves as normal.

The coin of Theodosius [**Pl. XI. 16**] has reverse identity with the Gratian of **Pl. X. 12**. The reverse is of the class A (a) which is the most common of the "irregularities"

both with Gratian's later portrait and with Maximus. Gratian is also found with the rather parrot-like portrait here given to Theodosius, and with reverse A (*a*). This latter reverse is linked by obverse identity with the reverse of **Pl. X. 5** where Gratian is given the "Valentinian II" portrait (as it seems to me). The reverse of **Pl. X. 5**—the very uncommon B (*b*)—looks earlier than those with which it is associated, but I suppose the combination would be possible towards the close of the "Curls 1" period.

Of the non-Gratian portraits [**Pl. X. 10, 11, 12**] nos. 10 and 11 have normal A reverse, 12 has A (*a*), which is fairly common for both Gratian and Maximus and to which the Maximus of **Pl. XII. 8** also belongs. They might all very well be dated at the end of Gratian's reign. The two unprepossessing portraits **Pl. X. 6** and **7** both have slightly "irregular" reverses which occur also with Maximus' earlier portraits.

Pl. X. 9 and **XII. 1** give examples of Gratian and Theodosius in the very rare $\overline{\text{A}} \text{ SMTR}$ issue. It will be seen that Gratian's portrait is that of **Pl. X. 10**. A Vienna coin with reverse identity with mine gives him a similar but rather larger portrait. In the very rare $\overline{\text{AE}} 3 \text{ SMTR}$ issue of this type Gratian has his "Curls 1" portrait, Valentinian II the portrait of **Pl. XI. 1**. In the still rarer $\overline{\text{AE}} 3 \text{ TRP}$ issue (not known to v Koblitz) Gratian has again "Curls 1". There must be other specimens than the one I possess, but where are they? This $\overline{\text{AE}}$ mint-mark $\overline{\text{TRP}}$ occurs on two $\overline{\text{A}}$ specimens seen by me. From Grovely Wood (*Num. Chron.*, 1906, p. 334) $\overline{\text{TRP}} \cdot \text{S}$ is given, but the dot can hardly be intentional. **Pl. X. 7** shows a blundered reverse **VRTVS**

Continuation by Maximus [Pl XI. 17-20, XII. 5-9].

There seems to have been no break at the death of Gratian either in this or in the companion issue **CONCORDIA AVGGG**. The reverse varieties carried over from Gratian to Maximus are A, B, and A (a). As we saw above, A is twice as numerous for Maximus as B and more than four times as numerous as A (a). It is significant that in the coins struck for Theodosius by Maximus, the less common varieties, i.e. those that were gradually supplanted by A, are the most frequently occurring. We can, therefore, infer that, as we should expect, they were struck early—no doubt at the beginning of the reign, when Maximus perhaps believed, and at any rate wished his new subjects to believe, that his usurpation was approved by Theodosius. From the scarcity of Theodosius' coins in this and in the *Concordia* type we may infer that the pretence of harmony was before long abandoned. Whether the short-lived *entente* of the end of 384, which met with cold recognition from Theodosius in a few extremely rare coins struck by him for Maximus at Constantinople (cf. *Num. Chron.*, 1934, p. 119), is commemorated also in any of the coins we are considering can hardly be proved.

The three commonest portraits of Maximus, viz. "Nose", "Regular", and "Youthful", represented here by Pl. XII. 7, 9, 8. respectively, appear combined with the reverse varieties as follows:—

"Nose"	A 63	B 28	A (a) 7	A (c) 7
"Regular"	A 29	B 14	A (a) 8	A (c) 5
"Youthful"	A 10	B 11	A (a) 3	

That these various portraits like the various reverses are contemporary and not successive is proved by

numerous die identities, of which I can show only a few here; e.g. Pl. XII. 8 and 9 link "Youthful" and "Regular" by A reverse identity; Pl. XII. 8 is itself linked by obverse identity to a B reverse, which is one of a well-defined little group of 7 B, all having "Youthful" portraits. One of these portraits occurs for Theodosius on a **CONCORDIA AVGGG**, which has reverse identity with the Theodosius of the Terling hoard (*Num. Chron.*, 1933, Pl. XVI. 43). Again, in Pl. XII. 6, 7 "Regular" and "Nose" are linked by B reverse identity. But no. 7 is linked by obverse identity with an A reverse, while no. 6 has obverse identity with another B reverse. It is clear that not only the portrait and reverse varieties, but also the two types *Virtus* and *Concordia* are contemporary.

Turning to the portraits of Theodosius on his coins struck by Maximus, Pl. XI 19 and 20 link "Youthful" and "Nose" by A (a) reverse identity. The "Nose" portrait of Theodosius in Pl. XI. 18 is linked by A (a) reverse identity to a "Regular" portrait of Maximus all but identical with Pl. XII. 9. Lastly, the Theodosius of Pl. XI. 17 is linked by A reverse identity to Maximus [Pl. XII. 5], both having very similar portraits of the "Nose" variety.

The mass of Maximus' coins, especially those with the predominant A reverse, were probably struck after he had ceased to strike for Theodosius, whose coins, as we saw, have the less common, i.e. earlier disappearing varieties.

At the end of the reign we have the coins of Victor. I can associate with these only a few of Maximus, one by reverse identity and the others by their similarity to this. They seem mostly undersized with rather

mean portraits and small-scale reverse types of both A and B varieties. A few having the rare mint-mark **TPRS** may come here, as this is found for Victor. But if it is a mere mistake, it could, of course, occur at any time. I am unable to trace any satisfactory connexion between the mass of Maximus' coinage and that at the end of his reign. I am inclined to suppose a cessation of a year or so before the elevation of Victor in 387.

Valentinian II's type: **VICTORIA AVGGG**.

This type, so intimately connected with Valentinian II throughout his reign, is at first, i.e. in its **AR** and **Æ 3** denominations, rarely shared by his co-regents, but, when shared, it is with Gratian and Theodosius and not with Valens. At Treveri the *siliqua* is not shared. The large numbers of **VICTORIA AVGGG TRPS** found for Valentinian II in the North Mendip hoard — 121 to 29 **VIRTVS ROMANORVM** of Gratian and 18 **CONCORDIA AVGGG** of Theodosius — suggest a much larger and, therefore, earlier issue than for the other types. But when we find that from Grovely Wood, Icklingham, and Terling, Valentinian has respectively only 6, 4, and 1 to 11, 8, and 10 of Gratian's and 6, 3, and 4 of Theodosius' types we feel that the high figures from North Mendip must be due to some special cause and do not represent the true proportion. The issue, then, must almost certainly have run parallel to the differentiated issues for Gratian and Theodosius.

As already mentioned, it is difficult to note stages in the issue with a view to dating. The different portraits seem more likely to be contemporaneous than successive, and the slight varieties of treatment of

Victory's wing and dress tend further to combine rather than to distinguish. For instance, Pl. XI. 1, which is linked with Pl. X. 20 by identity of a reverse with a peculiarly waved hem to the dress, has obverse identity with a coin whose reverse differs scarcely by a hair's breadth from that of Pl. XI. 3, which has a quite different portrait.

Pl. X. 20 has Valentinian's name without IVN, noted by me only in (very rare) duplicates of this coin. Pl. XI. 5 has the Æ mint-mark $\overline{\text{TRP}}$, and Victory's wreath breaks into the reverse legend in an unusual way. On a specimen in Vienna this legend appears on a *siliqua* with type "Victory advancing r., holding wreath in either hand". Its weight (2.54 grm.) and general appearance are against its genuineness. But this variety of the type occurs for Valentinian II at Siscia.

Theodosius' type: **CONCORDIA AVGGG**. Continued
by Maximus.

For this type at Lugdunum see p. 142. At Aquileia it occurs in Æ for Theodosius only, side by side with **VICTORIA AVGGG** (not **AVGG**) for Valentinian II only and **VIRTVS ROMANORVM** for (at first) Gratian only; later, **VIRTVS ROMANORVM** seems to have been shared by the other two Emperors and to have been continued by Valentinian II after Gratian's death.

A mere glance at Pl. XI. 7, 15 will be enough to satisfy us that the former coin was struck by Gratian, the latter by Maximus. It is fortunate that we have such indisputable examples of substitution of portrait as to place the issuers beyond question. The portrait of Maximus, indeed, for Theodosius in this type is not

so very uncommon, but the "Gratian" portrait of **Pl. XI. 7** is found, I think, only at Vienna, whence a cast was kindly supplied to me.

Even without this coin, Sir Arthur Evans' "unique"² specimen of Gratian himself [**Pl. X. 3**] would prove his participation in the issue, and careful observation of slight reverse varieties would associate some of Theodosius' coins with him and not with Maximus.

These varieties are, though slight, quite distinct:

1. On Gratian's own coin and on the "Gratian" Theodosius [**Pl. XI. 7**] the personified Constantinople shows below her cloak the vertical lines of her dress. The folds just below her waist run horizontally. **Pl. XI. 8, 9, 10** are similar and presumably struck by Gratian.
2. The dress below the cloak is not shown. The cloak is gathered up over the l. knee, leaving the l. leg bare [**Pl. XI. 11**].
3. As 2, but the cloak covers both legs [**Pl. XI. 12**].
4. As 1, but the folds just below the waist run vertically. All the coins of Maximus himself [**Pl. XII. 2, 3, 4**], and the Theodosius of **Pl. XI. 13, 14, 15** show this variety and all are presumably—most of them certainly—struck by Maximus.

All we can say with certainty is that some of Variety 1 are earlier than some of Variety 2. The two varieties may have been in part or even wholly contemporaneous and the grouping of the "Gratian" and the "Maximan" portraits into distinct varieties a mere

² Cohen must, however, have seen the coin as he values it at 10 fr. It was unknown to v. Koblitz.

chance. But probably no one will think this at all likely.

Varieties 2 and 3 are about as common as Variety 4 and more common than Variety 1. They both show uniformly Theodosius' "own" portrait, in strong contrast to the diversity of the portraiture in 1 and 4. It is his usual portrait on his coins struck by Gratian, but I have not found it on coins certainly struck for him by Maximus. I should, therefore, attribute these two varieties to Gratian's reign.

Like *VIRTVS ROMANORVM*, so *CONCORDIA AVGGG* seems to have gone on over the change of rulers without a break. The portraits of the coins struck by Maximus are the same for both issues, though those of Maximus with the *Concordia* and of Theodosius with the *Virtus* type are so scarce that I have not yet found an actual die-identity linking the issues. Probably the "Maximan" Variety 4 started under Gratian; more than half the portraits noted would suit the earlier period; e.g. that illustrated in *Num. Chron.*, 1933, Pl. XVI. 43,³ and those illustrated here [Pl. XI. 13, 14]. Pl. XI. 9, 11, 12, 13 were chosen to illustrate the continuity of the Gratian version of Theodosius' "own" portrait throughout the four reverse varieties. Probably a more convincing example than 13 can be found, but

³ This coin has *rev.* identity with two other coins, both showing a "Gratian" portrait of Theodosius, one in Lord Grantley's collection, the other in the British Museum. Lately at Vienna I saw in Capt. Hollschek's collection the portrait of the British Museum specimen combined with *rev.* Variety 1. Variety 4 must certainly have started under Gratian and have followed closely on, if not actually partly contemporary with, the purely "Gratian" Variety 1.

it certainly seems to me rather "Gratian" than "Maximan" in date.

For the sake of completeness I must just mention two other coins of Theodosius bearing a *Concordia* legend. Those who put their trust in Cohen for this period of the coinage may wonder why I have not mentioned his Theodosius I **CONCORDIA AVGG** "Rome seated, facing, holding globe and sceptre" **TRPS**. It is priced at 6 fr. and so is presumably by no means rare. Neither v. Koblitz nor myself had ever seen this except as a unique coin at Paris (where Cohen saw it) [Pl. XII. 10]. It looks to me like a very well executed ancient forgery and certainly did not come from the Treveran mint of this period. Last year Sir Arthur Evans kindly allowed me to inspect his coins, and no one will be surprised to hear that I found another example with **CONCORDIA AVGG TRPS** among them. In this case the obverse portrait was more distinctly barbarous or, rather, semi-barbarous, while the reverse—except for the **AVGG**—was that of the regular **Æ 3 CONCORDIA AVGGG** type and of perfectly legitimate appearance. Neither, I think, can claim to fall under the heading of these notes.

J. W. E. PEARCE.

XIII.

A HOARD OF SILVER CYPRIOT STATERS FROM LARNACA.¹

[SEE PLATES XIII-XVI.]

IN July 1933, while labourers were digging the foundations of a new wing of the Municipal Hospital at Larnaca, they came across a mass of coins at a depth of six feet. The Commissioner of the town, Mr. B. J. Surridge, was informed of the discovery, but meanwhile a good number had been scattered about by the labourers. Dr. G. M. Pietroni, the District Government Medical Officer, managed to collect some 153, which he gave to me; while another group of 70 was sent to me by the Commissioner.² The remainder of the 277, which was the total number of the coins saved at the time, were collected through careful sifting of the earth on the surface. Later, Mr. George Petrakides of Larnaca managed to collect two lots from dealers at various times, which he sent to me; the first of them contained 14 and the second 172 coins. These staters were originally sold to the dealers by labourers who shared among themselves part of the hoard on the day of discovery. Of the latter, all, with the exception

¹ I am greatly indebted to Mr. E. S. G. Robinson, Acting Deputy Keeper in the Department of Coins and Medals in the British Museum, for his most valuable advice regarding a number of details in this article and for the kindest care which he took in revising the text.

² My thanks are due to Mr. B. J. Surridge and to Dr. G. M. Pietroni, without whose valuable assistance so many of the above coins would not have been saved.

of 9 in very poor state, have been acquired by the Cyprus Museum through the kindness of Mr. Petrakides. In addition 99 staters which found their way to the London market soon after, and 2 staters which appeared at the same time in the hands of a Cypriot resident in S. Africa (all of which were examined in the British Museum) clearly came from the same hoard.

These coins are all Cypriot silver staters belonging to the later part of the sixth century and the first part of the fifth century B.C., and are attributed to several towns of Cyprus, as follows: Citium, 3; Idalium, 36; Lapethus, 143; Paphos, 292; Salamis, 51; and to the uncertain series, 29. Ten staters are unidentified owing to their much obliterated condition.

As in most cases of accidental discoveries, it was not possible to ascertain the exact conditions under which the hoard was discovered, for when I proceeded to the site of the discovery, the coins had already been removed. The coins seem to have been found in a compact mass, judging from what the labourers explained to me and from the state in which some coins were incrustated.

The site of the discovery is within the area of ancient Citium, and not far away is the Acropolis of this ancient town where, in 1929, the Swedish Cyprus Expedition discovered a temple of Melkart.³

In the description of these coins the classification followed is that of Sir George Hill in his *Catalogue of Greek Coins of Cyprus in the British Museum*, London, 1904. The types included in the hoard are for the most part known varieties, with the exception of certain new types, discussed below.

³ See E. Gjerstad, "Die schwedischen Ausgrabungen auf Cypem", published in *Die Antike*, ix, p. 261 seq.

CITTIUM.

1-3. *Obv.* Lion lying l., head reverted, jaws open; below, astragalos?

Rev. Smooth.

B.M.C. Cyprus, p. 8, no. 1.

1, 10.78 [Pl. XIII. 1]; 2-3, 10.53, 10.34, Cyprus Museum.

IDALIUM. c. 500-480 B.C.

4-6. *Obv.* Sphinx with plume on head and curled wings, seated r., l. forefoot raised over two palmettes; behind V (*Sa*), \pm (*Ba*); between wing and head \dagger (? *lo*); in front $\bar{\Gamma}$ (*na*) \perp (*O*?).

Rev. Square incuse.

B.M.C., p. 24, no. 4 (same *obv.* die)⁴.

4, 10.74 [Pl. XIII. 2], overstruck on no. 536 below (uncertain); 5, 10.72 [Pl. XIII. 3]; 6, 10.32 [Pl. XIII. 4], Cyprus Museum.

7-20. Similar, with various traces of the same inscription. 7-19, 10.75, 10.38, 10.43, 9.98, 9.99, 9.71, 9.71, and six unweighed,⁵ Cyprus Museum; 20, 10.92, S. Africa.

21-30. Similar; inscription, if any, obliterated (*B.M.C.* no. 4, or possibly 1).

21-26, 9.40, 9.98, 10.12, 10.14, 10.08, 10.27, Cyprus Museum; 27-30, 10.62, 9.99, 9.85, 9.72, Market.

31-34. *Obv.* Sphinx with curled wing and plume, seated r.,

⁴ Hill, however, read VI for the letters behind wing, and T for the letter between wing and head, the third group being invisible; the reading given above can be established from the first three coins, neither of them being complete in itself.

⁵ One of these is overstruck on a coin of Paphos, most probably of King Pny. . . , the feathers of the eagle's head being visible on the reverse (*B.M.C.*, p. 36, no. 4 seqq.).

with l. forefoot raised over two palmettes; pellet on flank; on r. \ddagger (*Ba*), on l. ∇ (*Ki*).

Rev. Lotus on two spiral tendrils in incuse shaped to the type.

Cp. *B.M.C.*, nos. 7-8.

31, 10-44 [Pl. XIII. 5]; and 32-34, unweighed, Cyprus Museum.

35-38. *Obv.* Similar but an oval pellet added between wing and head; inscription obliterated.

Rev. Similar.

Cp. *B.M.C.*, no. 7.⁶

35, 9-77 [Pl. XIII. 6]; 36-38, 10-19, 10-05, 9-67, Cyprus Museum.

39. *Obv.* Similar, but without plume or pellets; on r. \ddagger (*Ba*), on l. ∇ (*Ki*).

Rev. Similar.

B.M.C., nos. 8-9.

10-62, Market.

LAPETHUS.

40-44. *Obv.* Head of Athena r. in Athenian helmet, wearing circular ear-ring; behind traces of letters (Phoenician script); dotted circle.

Rev. Head of Athena r., with long hair, in crestless Corinthian helmet; square incuse.

B.M.C. ibid., p. 29, no. 1.

40, 10-38 [Pl. XIII. 7]; 41-42, 9-98, 9-74, Cyprus Museum; 43-44, 10-76, 8-95, Market.

45. *Obv.* Head of Aphrodite r., hair waved round crown and falling in four curls on neck; wears circular ear-ring.

⁶ The pellet on the flank, though not recorded in the Catalogue, is present on the B.M. specimen.

Rev. Head of Athena r., with long hair, in crestless Corinthian helmet.

Cp. *B.M.C.*, nos. 3-5.

10-76 [Pl. XIII. 8], British Museum.

46. *Obv.* Similar, eye more archaic?

Rev. Similar (the same die, later use).

9-34 [Pl. XIII. 9], Cyprus Museum.

47-57. *Obv.* Head of Aphrodite r.,⁷ hair in straight waves and falling in three curls on neck; wears circular ear-ring.

Rev. Similar.

B.M.C., no. 3 (same dies).

47, 9-56 [Pl. XIII. 10]; 48, 9-67 [Pl. XIII. 11], 17 unweighed, Cyprus Museum; 49-56, 10-04, 10-68, 11-02, 10-49, 8-99, 9-88, 10-52, 9-97, Market; 57, 11-05, S. Africa.

58-97. *Obv.* and *Rev.* The same dies?

58-95, 9-88, 10-00, 10-01, 9-07, 10-58, 10-40, 10-30, 9-85, 9-27, 9-84, 9-93, 9-42, 9-17, 9-51, 9-73, 9-80, 11-03, 10-04, 9-32, 9-47, 9-60, and 17 unweighed, Cyprus Museum; 96-97, 10-18, 10-50, Petrakides.

98-112. *Obv.* Head of Aphrodite r., as on preceding coins.

Rev. Head of Athena l., with short hair in crestless Corinthian helmet.

B.M.C., no. 2 (same dies).

98, 10-74 British Museum; 99-112, 11-29, 10-41, 10-56, 10-60, 10-64, 10-26, 10-00, 9-75 (broken), 11-11, 10-86, 10-53, 11-03, 10-71, 10-46, Market.

113-160. *Obv.* and *Rev.* Similar: the same dies?

113-154, 10-58, 10-00, 10-39, 10-04, 9-07, 8-71, 10-13, 10-26, 10-50, 10-30, 10-33, 9-81, 10-59, 10-22,

⁷ The obverse die degenerates in remarkable fashion, finally leaving the type quite obliterated.

9.76, 9.86, 10.13, 10.14, 9.29, 10.11, 9.73, 9.93, 10.13, 10.03, 10.10, 10.43, 9.31, 9.87, 9.46, 10.65, 8.44, 7.37, 7.22 and nine unweighed, Cyprus Museum; 155-160, 10.29, 10.32, 10.61, 10.53, 10.43, 11.08, Petrakides.

161-181. *Obv.* Similar head of Aphrodite, almost obliterated.

Rev. Head of Athena r., with short hair in crested Corinthian helmet (the crest marked in linear style).

B.M.C., no. 4 (same dies).

161, 10.56 [Pl. XIII. 12]; 162, 9.83 [Pl. XIV. 1]; 163-169, seven unweighed, Cyprus Museum; 170, 10.52, British Museum; 171-181, 10.49, 10.43, 10.21, 10.22, 10.49, 10.24, 9.74, 10.24, 10.49, 10.56, 10.48, Market.

182. *Obv.* Head of Aphrodite (?) r.

Rev. Head of Athena l., with long hair (?) in crested Corinthian helmet, framed in dotted square; square incuse.

9.99 [Pl. XIV. 2], Cyprus Museum.

PAPHOS.

183-185. *Obv.* Smooth (type obliterated in die).

Rev. Eagle's head l.; in upper l. corner palmette within joined spirals; the whole in dotted (?) incuse square.

183, 10.76 [Pl. XIV. 3]; 184, 10.61, Cyprus Museum; 185, 10.20, Market.

Uncertain King A . . .


186. *Obv.* Bull walking l., below * \pm (*Ba A*).

Rev. Similar.

Cp. Babelon, *Traité*, no. 1278.

10.64 [Pl. XIV. 4], Cyprus Museum.


Uncertain King Phn . . .

187-193. *Obv.* Bull standing l. on dotted line; above,  (Pu).

Rev. Similar.

B.M.C. ibid., p. 36, nos. 6-7.


187, 10.54 [Pl. XIV. 5]; 188-193, 10.03, 10.00, 9.78, 10.45, and two unweighed, Cyprus Museum.

194-220. *Obv.* Similar, but above  K (Pu-nu).

Rev. Similar.

B.M.C., no. 5.

194, 10.21 [Pl. XIV. 6]; 195, 10.51 [Pl. XIV. 7]; 196-220, 10.19, 10.23, 10.45, 8.81, 9.59, 9.73, 10.04, 9.91, 10.53, 10.43, 10.30, 9.86, 10.53, 9.78, and eleven unweighed, Cyprus Museum.

221-230. *Obv.* Similar, but above  (Pu-nu).

Rev. Similar.

Cp. B.M.C., no. 8.

221, 10.37 [Pl. XIV. 8]; 222-230, 9.77, 9.97, 9.88, 10.00, and five unweighed, Cyprus Museum.

231-426. *Obv.* Similar, but inscription absent (or off flan).

Rev. Similar.

Cp. B.M.C., nos. 9-13.

231, 10.83 [Pl. XIV. 9]; 232-421, 10.32, 10.70, 9.62, 10.07, 9.77, 10.34, 10.30, 10.95, 10.16, 9.99, 10.64, 9.82, 10.05, 10.50, 9.86, 10.38, 9.80, 9.78, 10.09, 10.11, 9.41, 10.12, 9.53, 10.19, 9.95, 10.52, 10.53, 10.62, 10.24, 10.00, 10.19, 10.72, 9.39, 9.67, 10.00, 9.47, 10.30, 10.47, 9.71, 10.20, 9.99, 9.99, 10.50, 10.52, 9.73, 10.18, 9.61, 10.40, 9.29, 9.62, 10.44, 10.45, 9.76, 9.99, 9.73, 10.38, 10.26, 9.99, 10.45, 10.33, 10.10, 10.15, 10.04, 10.85, 10.32, 10.09, 9.43, 9.96, 10.03, 10.43, 10.44, 10.10, 9.92, 9.27, 10.28, 9.93, 9.71, 10.12, 9.94, 10.12, 10.34, 10.17, 10.09, 10.44, 10.24, 10.06, 9.88, 9.33, 9.62, 10.13, 9.80, 9.73, 10.18, 10.37, 9.07, 9.87, 9.89, 10.43, 10.13, 10.15, 9.81, 10.26, 10.18, 10.10, and eighty-six unweighed, Cyprus Museum; 422-426, 9.44, 10.00, 10.01, 10.24, 10.19, Petrakides.

427-474. *Obv.* Similar, with or without inscription.

Rev. Similar.

B.M.C., nos. 4-13.

10-20, 10-75, 10-74, 10-65, 10-78, 10-84, 10-67,
10-68, 10-67, 10-78, 11-00, 10-63, 10-52, 10-51,
10-63, 10-67, 10-88, 10-68, 10-71, 10-75, 10-63,
10-57, 10-76, 10-83, 10-74, 10-72, 10-69, 10-74,
10-59, 10-57, 10-81, 10-40, 10-15, 10-24, 10-45,
10-45, 10-84, 10-45, 10-09, 10-39, 9-87, 9-82, 9-89,
9-92, 10-22, 10-02, 9-95, 10-23, Market.

SALAMIS.

475-476. *Obv.* Ram lying l.; above, uncertain inscription (not the name of Eueltion?).

Rev. Smooth.

475, 10-89 [Pl. XIV. 10]; 476, 10-23, Cyprus Museum.

Eueltion.

477-505. *Obv.* Ram lying l.; above and below, $\text{I} \Lambda *$
(*E-u-ve-le-to-ne*) (never complete). $\text{II} \text{I} \text{F} \text{S}$

Rev. Smooth.

B.M.C. ibid., p. 46, nos. 1-3.

477, 10-76 [Pl. XIV. 11]; 478, 10-12 [Pl. XIV. 12];
479-501, 10-57, 10-30, 10-95, 9-92, 10-37, 10-69,
10-43, 9-66, 10-47, 9-92, 10-33, 10-70, 10-50, 10-78,
10-47, 10-19, and seven unweighed, Cyprus
Museum; 502-505, 10-74, 10-76, 10-92, 11-40,
Market.

506-507. *Obv.* Similar.

Rev. Traces of broken-down square incuse, perhaps due to over-striking.

506, 10-15 [Pl. XV. 1], Cyprus Museum; 507, 10-50, Market.

508-524. *Obv.* Ram lying l.; inscription above and below (usually $\text{I} \text{F} \text{F} \text{S} \text{I} \Lambda *$, *E-u-ve-le-to-to-se*).




Rev. Ankh in incuse square in each corner of which a spray of leaves; in centre of ankh ✕ (*Ku*).

B.M.C., nos. 15 *seqq.*

508, 10.43 [Pl. XV. 2]; 509, 10.18 [Pl. XV. 3]; 510-522, 10.47, 10.23, 10.32, 10.74, 9.73, 9.31, and seven unweighed, Cyprus Museum. 523, 10.73, Petrakidis; 524, 10.62, Market.

Uncertain Ruler.

525. *Obv.* Ram lying l., inscription, if any, obliterated.

Rev. Ram's head l., truncation dotted; to l., laurel branch; below    (transliteration undetermined).

B.M.C., no. 34.

10.43 [Pl. XV. 4], Cyprus Museum.

UNCERTAIN.

Group A.

526-527. *Obv.* Uncertain type, bearded head r. ?

Rev. Head of Herakles r., bearded, wearing lion-skin in square dotted frame; square incuse.

B.M.C. ibid., p. 67.

526, 10.32 [Pl. XV. 5]; 527, 9.84, Cyprus Museum.

528-529. *Obv.* Bearded giant l., in 'kneeling-running' attitude.

Rev. Herakles, wearing lion-skin over head and hanging down back, in 'kneeling-running' attitude r.; he holds bow in outstretched l. hand and brandishes club in raised r.; square dotted frame; in r. upper corner possibly a letter (undecipherable); square incuse.

528, 10.34 [Pl. XV. 6]; 529, 10.22 [Pl. XV. 7], Cyprus Museum.

530. *Obv.* Bearded head r.

Rev. Similar, knees less flexed; no trace of possible letter.

10.25 [Pl. XV. 8].

Group B.

531-532. *Obv.* Forepart of lion r., jaws open; above \neq (*Ba*)
 \curvearrowright (*Vo* or *Ka*), dotted circle.

Rev. Gorgoneion; sprays in corners; square dotted frame; square incuse.

531, 10.46 [Pl. XV. 9]; 532, 10.30 [Pl. XV. 10]
 (? same dies), Cyprus Museum.

Group C.

533-534. *Obv.* Head of lion l., jaws open; tongue protruded.

Rev. Head of bull r., truncation dotted; above on l., $\neq \nabla$ (*Ba Phi*); square incuse.

B.M.C. ibid., p. 69, no. 3 (same dies).

533, 10.30 [Pl. XVI. 1]; 534, 10.04, Cyprus Museum.

535. *Obv.* Similar lion's head r., truncation dotted.

Rev. Similar bull's head r.; in front downwards,
 $\neq \nabla$ (*Ba Phi*); dotted circle; circular incuse.

10.11 [Pl. XVI. 2], Cyprus Museum.

536-538. *Obv.* Similar lion's head l.

Rev. Similar bull's head l.; on l. branch; beneath
 $\nabla \neq$ (*Sa Ba*).

536, 10.37 [Pl. XVI. 3]; 537-538, 10.20, 9.71,
 Cyprus Museum.

539. *Obv.* The same (same die?).

Rev. Similar but linear truncation.

10.24 [Pl. XVI. 4], British Museum.

540. *Obv.* Similar lion's head l.

Rev. Similar bull's head; in front, traces of letters
 \ddagger - - ? (*Ba* - -); square incuse.

10-55, Cyprus Museum.

541-546. *Obv.* Similar lion's head r.

Rev. Similar bull's head r.; no legend?; square incuse.

541, 10-60 [Pl. XVI. 5]; 542-545, 10-78, 10-11, 9-97, and one unweighed, Cyprus Museum; 546, 10-74, Market.

Group D.

547-552. *Obv.* Similar lion's head l.

Rev. Octopus; below, on l. \uparrow (*Vo* or *Ka*), on r. no trace of letter; ⁸ square incuse.

547, 10-65 [Pl. XVI. 6]; 548-552, 10-34, 10-56, 10-12, 9-37, 9-78, Cyprus Museum.

553. *Obv.* Similar lion's head r.

Rev. Octopus; below, on l. ϕ (*mo*), on r. trace of \ddagger (*Ba*)?; square incuse.

10-58 [Pl. XVI. 7], Cyprus Museum.

Group E.

554. *Obv.* Beardless male head l. in crestless helmet with cheek- and neck-piece; across bottom of neck and neck-piece V \ddagger V (*Sa ba sa*); above, on neck-piece \dagger (*lo*?). Type nearly obliterated.

Rev. Female(?) figure, with four wings, kneeling (running?) r., the arms turned into the hips.

Cp. *Zeit. f. Num.*, xxxvii (1927), p. 74, no. 131, same dies.

10-08 [Pl. XVI. 8], Cyprus Museum.

556-564. Undecipherable.

⁸ The surface, however, has suffered through cleaning.

CITIUM.

Of the coins usually attributed to Citium the hoard contains 3 staters (nos. 1 [Pl. XIII. 1] to 3), the earliest type with the recumbent lion with back-turned head.

IDALIUM.

Idalium is represented by 36 silver staters, of which the first group (nos. 4-30 [Pl. XIII. 2-4]) includes the type with the Sphinx, and incuse square only on reverse,⁹ dated about 500-480 B.C. Of these staters, some are inscribed, the inscription on the remainder having been obliterated. A second group (nos. 31-39 [Pl. XIII. 5-6]) includes coins of the Sphinx type and the lotus flower in incuse impression, fitting the shape of type,¹⁰ dated about 475 B.C. Hill attributes these coins to a king whose name begins with Ki; our specimens as a rule bear no legible inscription.

LAPETHUS.

The hoard contains 143 silver staters of the types attributed to this town.¹¹ The first type with the head of Athena in Athenian helmet, and the head of Athena in Corinthian helmet on the reverse, is represented by four specimens (nos. 40-44 [Pl. XIII. 7]), dated about 480 B.C. I have placed nos. 45-6 [Pl. XIII. 8-9] at the head of the following type with the head of Aphrodite and the head of Athena in Corinthian helmet on the reverse, on the grounds of its more archaic style. Coins nos. 47-160 [Pl. XIII. 10, 11] belong to the type with the head of Aphrodite with waved hair and curls falling




⁹ *B.M.C.*, p. li, group I.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, group III.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. liii ff.

on the neck, and the head of Athena in Corinthian helmet, and are approximately assigned to 480 B.C.¹² Nos. 161-181 [Pl. XIII. 12, XIV. 1] belong to this series, with the variation that the head of Athena on the reverse is on a larger scale with a crested helmet, although the crest is in linear style.

PAPHOS.

The bulk of the silver staters contained in the hoard, 292 in number, have the obverse die worn smooth and an eagle's head on the reverse. Some of these (nos. 183-185 [Pl. XIV. 3]) may perhaps be placed before the class, here represented by no. 186 [Pl. XIV. 4]), attributed to a king whose name begins with A . . . ;¹³ the rest (nos. 187-474 [Pl. XIV. 5-9]) belong to the class attributed to the king *Πυρ* . . .¹⁴ about 460 B.C., with the bull on obverse and the eagle's head on reverse, and inscribed with  or K or  and another undeciphered letter on left; quite a number of the same type are uninscribed.

SALAMIS.

Euelthon is the king mostly represented in this hoard; we mention firstly the type (nos. 477-505 [Pl. XIV. 11-12]) with the ram lying l., with inscription above and below generally *E-v-φ-ε-λ-ε-θ-ω-ν-ε*.¹⁵ The stater, no. 475 [Pl. XIV. 10] seems to bear a different inscription, but decipherment is impossible owing to its partly obliterated state. To the same king belongs the following group nos. 508-524 [Pl. XV. 2, 3] with ram lying l., and ankh symbol on the reverse. The

¹² *Ibid.*, Pl. VI. 2, 3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Pl. VII. 4-9.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. lxvii, Pl. XXI. 4.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xc, Pl. IX.

letter representing *Kv* in the circle of the ankh¹⁶ is visible on most of the specimens of the group. Type no. 525 [Pl. XV. 4] is the same as no. 34 in the British Museum catalogue¹⁷; it belongs to the uncertain types dated about 480-450 B.C.

UNCERTAIN.

Coins of Group A, nos. 526-527 [Pl. XV. 5], are the same as the coin illustrated by Hill, Pl. XIII. 2, and dated c. 480 B.C. Nos. 528-530 [Pl. XV. 6, 7, 8] yield new types. Nos. 528-529 show a bearded giant in a kneeling-advancing attitude on the obverse, and Herakles, with bow in left and a club in right hand, on the reverse. The giant figured on the obverse reminds one of the herdsman appearing on the limestone relief found by L. P. di Cesnola at Athienou, representing the adventure of Herakles with the cattle of Geryon.¹⁸ The figure of Herakles represented on the reverse of the stater seems to confirm the comparison with the scene on the relief, on which Herakles appears on the left, on rising ground. No. 530 has a somewhat similar reverse and a male head on the obverse. Group B, nos. 531-532 [Pl. XV. 9, 10] also show new types. These wonderful specimens, with the forepart of lion on the obverse and the Gorgoneion on the reverse, may be compared with the coin illustrated by Hill on Pl. XIII. 3, which probably belongs to Soli. Of Group C, nos. 533-534 [Pl. XVI. 1, 2] are identical with the stater figured by him on Pl. XIII. 7. With this may be com-

¹⁶ *B.M.C.*, Pl. IX. 12.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, Pl. X. 12.

¹⁸ See J. L. Myres, *Handbook of Cesnola Collection*, New York, 1914, p. 234.

pared no. 535, a new variety. The following specimens, nos. 536-539 [Pl. XVI. 3, 4], with the head of lion l., with open jaw, and bull's head with branch in front and inscription below, $\vee \neq$ ($B\alpha-\Sigma\alpha-$), may be attributed to the same series. With this series may also be compared nos. 540-546 [Pl. XVI. 5] with the lion's head and bull on the reverse. The staters of Group D, nos. 547-553 [Pl. XVI. 6, 7], are also of new types. The obverse has the head of a lion with open jaws and the reverse an octopus usually with the letter \blacktriangle below, in left hand corner. The reverse of this coin is evidently copied from the coin of Eretria, of the beginning of the fifth century B.C.¹⁹ The letter \mathfrak{A} , which is on the Eretrian coin, is replaced, in exactly the same place, by the Cypriot letter.

Finally, in the one coin, no. 554 [Pl. XVI. 8], of Group E we have another specimen of the previously unique and highly interesting stater from the Damanhur Hoard now in Berlin.

P. DIKAIOS.

¹⁹ B. V. Head, *Historia Numorum*, Oxford, 1911, p 362, fig. 205.

XIV.

NOTES ON THE LARNACA HOARD.

THIS notable find equals in importance the famous Dali hoard of 1869, which was published by Sir Hamilton Lang in this Journal (*Num. Chron.*, 1871, pp. 1-18), and the thanks of all students are due to Mr. Dikaïos, the Curator of the Cyprus Museum, for the energy which he has displayed in reassembling it so far as possible, and also for the skill with which, though not primarily a numismatist, he has prepared it for publication. I had the advantage of discussing the hoard with him personally, and it soon became clear that other Cypriote coins (obviously from a find) which had recently been examined at the British Museum¹ formed a part of the same great hoard. In order to make the publication as complete as possible it was suggested—and Mr. Dikaïos kindly consented—that the record which had been made of this portion of the hoard should be incorporated into his article, and that any further comments should be added in the present appendix. Of the coins in the Cyprus Museum I have actually handled only those here illustrated.

Citium, no. 1 [Pl. XIII. 1]. The symbol beneath the lion described by Hill as an astragalus is very doubtful; by a comparison of the present coin with the Museum specimen it appears rather to be a ram's head to left, a symbol which occurs frequently on the later issues of Baalmelek I (cp. *B.M.C.*, nos. 3 *seqq.*).

¹ Four of these were subsequently purchased, nos. 45, 98, 170, and 539. M. Seyrig informs me that he recently saw in Syria another parcel of similar coins, probably also belonging to the hoard.

Idalium, nos. 4-6 [Pl. XIII. 2-4]. These three coins are all from the same obverse die, and nos. 4 and 6 from the same reverse punch. The break of the die above the sphinx's wings shows no. 6 to have been struck first, and it will be noted that the die at this stage lacks the cross on the upper wing of the sphinx, which Mr. Dikaïos interprets as the sign for *-lo*. On no. 4, the next coin in order, this sign has been added, while the reverse punch shows greater wear leading to the substitution of a fresh reverse punch which had itself been considerably damaged by the time that no. 5 came to be struck. The addition of the cross-like sign after the die had been in use for some time is paralleled in the following series. Whatever its significance, it shows that the primary elements of the inscription are *o-na-sa-ba*. These are all quite certain,² though, of course, the order in which they should be arranged is not determined. If they are read as here set out the first three might contain a name and the fourth the royal title *Ba-(σιλεως)* as so frequently abbreviated on Cypriote coins. The name of a Philokypros son of Onasagoras occurs on the famous Dali tablet³ (c. 449 B.C.?) as an eponymus magistrate or priest of the year at Idalium. So important a man may well have been of the blood royal, and it is possible that we have his father's name on the present coin. The fact that no. 4 with the incuse reverse is overstruck on a coin with a fully developed reverse type shows that the incuse reverse in Cyprus is not always a sign of great antiquity. Nos. 31 [Pl. XIII. 5]

² Three had been previously read on the worn B.M. specimen (*B.M.C.*, no. 4, and p. xlix) as *E-ta-li*.

³ Collitz-Bechtel, *Samml. der gr. Dialektinschr.*, I, no. 60.

to 34, 35 [Pl. XIII. 6] to 38, 39, are all from the same obv. and reverse dies, though here again the obverse die appears in various states. Not only so, but almost incredible though it may seem, all the coins in the British Museum catalogued under the heading "Uncertain King *Ki*..?" (*B.M.C.*, nos. 5-9) appear to come from this same pair of dies in different states. If this is so the chronological order there given is upside down and must be reversed to yield the following sequence: (1) *B.M.C.*, nos. 8-9, Plate V. 7-8. *Obv.* with *Ba-* on r. and *Ki-* on l., without plume on sphinx's head and without pellet either on sphinx's flank or between her neck and wings. On *B.M.C.*, no. 8, there is a flaw in the fifth section counting from the right of the outer wing, and another immediately between the base of the wing and the back. *B.M.C.*, no. 9, does not show the second flaw, and the place where the first comes is off the flan. Both flaws may be traced where the accidents of striking permit, on all coins made from this die in its subsequent states, and thus help to identify it. (2) nos. 31 *seqq.* above [Pl. XIII. 5]. *Obv.* inscription *Ba-* on r., *Ki-* on l.; a plume has now been added to the sphinx's head and a pellet appears on the flank where the wing crosses it. (3) nos. 35 *seqq.* above [Pl. XIII. 6]. *Obv.* inscription obliterated in the die, except for traces of *Ki-* on l.; in addition to the plume and the pellet on flank an oblong pellet now appears between the back of the neck and the upper wing. A coin from the Dali hoard in the British Museum (presented by Sir R. H. Lang since the catalogue) is from exactly the same stage of the die and repeats all its peculiarities. (4) *B.M.C.*, no. 7 [Pl. V. 6]. *Obv.* inscription on r. off flan, presumably

the same as on the following coin; on l. *Ba-si-* downwards; plume and pellets as before. (5) *B.M.C.*, no. 5 [Pl. V. 4]. *Obv.* inscription on r. *Ki-vo*-,⁴ on l., off flan, presumably *Ba-si-* as on the preceding coin; plume and pellets as before; across the lower part of the wing a cross-like sign has been added. (6) *B.M.C.*, no. 6 [Pl. V. 5], overstruck on a stater of Baalmelek I of Citium. *Obv.* inscription and detail so far as ascertainable the same as on the last, but an upright has been added to the cross, passing over and obliterating the pellet on the flank.

The order here set out is confirmed by examination of the progressive deterioration of the reverse die which is also the same throughout. This reverse, however, finally broke down before its companion, for there is a stater in the British Museum from the Dali hoard (presented by Sir R. H. Lang after the catalogue) which, though still showing this the final state of the obverse die, is from a new and clean reverse. While dies in Cyprus seem to have been continued in use longer than was the custom elsewhere (except perhaps in Lycia), it is hard to find a reason for these constant additions and alterations, though the later legend anyhow is clearly an expansion of the earlier. It is hard, too, to see what is the significance of the cross-like sign added here and on the preceding series (nos. 4-6) when the die had begun to break up. It is so roughly formed that it hardly looks like a letter, though it may be *lo*-.

⁴ Reading with Hill downwards, from r. to l., *Ki-vo*-. But since the die is going to pieces the central stroke of the second letter which is very badly formed may be a flaw; if so it would be possible to read upwards, from l. to r., *Vo-ki-sa*-.

Lapethus, nos. 47 *seqq.* [Pl. XIII. 10-12]. Here again a very large number of coins from no. 47 onwards appears to come from the same obverse die, which is used until the type is practically unrecognizable. On no. 182 [Pl. XIV. 2] the *obv.* is so worn that the type is almost obliterated, but it rather gives the impression of a helmeted head, e.g. Athena as on nos. 40-44 [Pl. XIII. 7].

Paphos, no. 183 [Pl. XIV. 3]. *Rev.* There appears to be no line of cable pattern beneath the head, and this and the shape generally, suggest that the animal may be a ram rather than an eagle. If so the coin would come at the beginning of the uncertain series catalogued by Hill under Salamis, *B.M.C.*, p. 52, nos. 32-36, Pl. X. 11-14, here no. 525, Pl. XV. 4; on one of these a similar palmette ornament occurs, copied from the Paphian series, though it is inverted, while the animal's head is turned the other way. The dating of the bull/eagle's head types is discussed under no. 506 of Salamis and in the conclusion of these notes.

Salamis, nos. 475-476 [Pl. XIV. 10]. *Obv.* The inscription slants upwards from right to left and unfortunately is partly off the flan, but it is impossible to extract any part of the name of Euclthon from it. How many letters it originally contained cannot be said; three are preserved wholly or in part, and there are traces of a fourth on the extreme right. The three letters reading from right to left appear to be Ψ (*la*), Γ (*no*?), and Σ (*ro*).

No. 506 [Pl. XV. 1]. This coin is overstruck on a stater of Paphos, the eagle's head to l. and palmette ⁵

⁵ Fortunately the direction of the palmette, base downwards,

on l. above, showing clearly in the beaded, rectangular frame. The overstriking is important from the chronological point of view, as the coins of Salamis with smooth reverse on the current dating are not later than 525, while the mass of the Paphian staters with eagle's head are dated to the middle of the fifth century.⁶ Even the earliest, the very rare coins of King A., cannot be far separated in time from the others. In fact, as will emerge when the question of the general dating of the hoard is discussed, an earlier date for these Paphos coins is required if they are to fit into the rest of the hoard, and the present overstrike seems to require a date so much earlier as hardly to leave room for the Bokaros coins of King Pasi . . at all (*B.M.C.*, p. 35, nos. 1-3). These last may, therefore, well belong to another mint, for the grounds of the attribution are by no means strong. On the other hand, the period during which coins with smooth reverse were struck at Salamis must be extended into the fifth century.

Uncertain, nos. 526-530 [Pl. XV. 5-8]. This group of coins is of exceptional interest. Only one (no. 526) was known before, and that only in a specimen in which the obverse type was obliterated. Though even on the present specimen the die is much worn, there can be no doubt that a male head is intended and little doubt that he is bearded.⁷ No. 530 [Pl. XV. 8]

shows it to be a coin of Paphos and not of the prototype from Ialysus.

⁶ Hill, *B.M.C.*, pp. 46 and 36.

⁷ On *B.M.C.*, p. 67, the obverse type is described as "uncertain, ram lying l. ?". By turning the illustration (Pl. XIII. 2) on its side one can see the vaguer shape of the same head as appears on the coin here published.

shows what must be the same head. The obverse type of nos. 528-529 [Pl. XV. 6-7], which Mr. Dikaios brilliantly interprets as a giant, is among the most remarkable in the whole Cypriot series. Unfortunately both coins are in a very poor state, but enough is left to enable us to determine the details with some closeness. The giant can hardly be in the "kneeling-running" attitude; the knees, especially the left one, are too flexed for that; his left hand passes behind the body, his right in front. In fact he has just been brought to his knees by Herakles, shot through the shoulders; the left hand is clapped against the wound in his back, the right hand clutches his diaphragm, the head is bowed on his chest; poor though the preservation of the coin is, the effect of convulsive movement is remarkably rendered. The general conception recalls the wounded Niobid in the Terme Museum.⁸ On the reverse we are shown the hero who has laid the giant low, with bow and club still in pursuit. Whom does the head on nos. 526-527 and no. 530 [Pl. XV. 5, 8] represent? No. 530 is so closely linked by its reverse type, the running Herakles, with the two preceding coins (nos. 528-529, Pl. XV. 6, 7), that it is tempting to link the obverse types also, and call the head here and on nos. 526-527, that of the giant. Otherwise it is perhaps Herakles again, though the lion-skin head-dress might have been expected to show more clearly. A head of the same deity on both sides of the coin is unusual but not unknown, e.g. at Lapethus.

Uncertain, nos. 531-553 [Pl. XV. 9-XVI. 7]. The magnificent obverse type of nos. 531-532 [Pl. XV. 9, 10]

⁸ A. W. Lawrence, *Classical Sculpture*, Pl. 59.

strongly resembles the full-length lion on the stater assigned by Six to Golgi,⁹ and may be placed in the same group, other members of which] (nos. 533-546, **Pl. XVI.** 1-5) are strongly represented in the hoard. As Mr. Dikaïos points out above, there are also close type-links with a group of coins of a different fabric now attributed to Soli (*B.M.C.*, p. 68), and this reopens the question whether Six was not after all right in assigning both groups to one and the same mint in spite of the varying fabric.

To the same group as nos. 531-532 seem also to belong the new staters with octopus reverse (nos. 547-553, **Pl. XVI.** 6-7) for they are linked by their obverse type, the lion's head, to the long series with the bull's head reverse (nos. 533-546, **Pl. XVI.** 1-5), and, though this may be accidental, the first of them carries the same initial letter as that of the king on nos. 531-532 [**Pl. XV.** 9-10]. The octopus reverse is directly copied from coins of Eretria and on nos. 547-552 [**Pl. XVI.** 6] the letter is even drawn and placed in such a way as to simulate the initial E of the city name. This Eretrian coinage comes to an end with the destruction of the town by the Persians in 490, and its Cypriot copies will belong to the decade 500-490. In 498 the Cypriot Greeks joined the Ionians in revolt and were therefore in especially close touch with their western kinsmen. Eretria and Athens were the only two cities of mainland Greece that also joined the Ionians, and both took part in the fighting in Asia in that year. This is just such an occasion as might give rise to the

⁹ *B.M.C.*, **Pl. XIII.** 5, note particularly the way the forepaws curve up—and outwards.

imitation of Eretrian types in Cyprus, and it looks as if the staters in question may belong to the actual year of the revolt. Similarly the obverse type of the Athenian tetradrachm of c. 500 is imitated at Lapethus (no. 40 above, Pl. XIII. 7) though, in view of the wide use of Athenian currency, the fact of its imitation need not be so significant.

Uncertain, no. 554 [Pl. XVI. 8]. The reverse type is most interesting. The British Museum possesses a third-stater of the same issue which in spite of the smaller denomination is struck from the same reverse die before it had suffered so much wear. On this the breasts indicate the sex of the figure which is clearly holding in both hands a disk pressed against her body, exactly as does the draped male solar or stellar god of Mallus (*B.M.C., Cilicia*, p. 97, nos. 12 *seqq.*). A solar goddess is not unknown in Northern Syria,¹⁰ but its occurrence as a coin-type in Cyprus is a remarkable instance of the strong Eastern influences to which the island was subject.

When was the hoard buried? With this question in mind it is interesting to compare it with the first Dali hoard. The latter contained a large number of the same classes of archaic coins, but it also contained some coins of the second half of the fifth century, especially of Citium, the latest being staters of Baal-

¹⁰ Cp. Shapash definitely attested by Ras Shamra texts as a female sun goddess *Syria* XII (1931) p. 205, l. 24; also the egyptianizing alabaster vase in human shape from the Polledrara tomb depicting a woman holding a sun-disk (Pryce, *B.M.C., Gl. Sculp.*, I Pt. 2 pp. 158-159, fig. 3); these are attributed to N. Syria. In Anatolia there is also the well-known sun goddess of Arinna (Garstang *Hittite Empire*, p. 73). I owe these references to my colleague Mr. R. D. Barnett.

melek II. The Dali hoard, therefore, cannot have been buried before the last quarter of the century, a date confirmed by the two fresh Athenian tetradrachms (*B.M.C.*, nos. 46 and 51) found in it. The present hoard is more homogeneous. The coins of Idalium only run down to the first issue of the king *Ki* . . . and do not include either those with his fuller title or those with the cross-like sign subsequently engraved on to the die which are sometimes overstruck over coins of Baalmelek I of Citium, *c.* 479. Nor are there any coins of king *Gra* . . . to whom the date *c.* 460 is conventionally assigned, though the style of his sphinx suggests that this is ten years too late. All the coins of Lapethus are of the earliest type with pronounced full-faced eye; and, considering the long usage suffered by the dies with which they were struck, their beginning cannot well be placed later than the first decade of the century.

The Paphian staters are practically all of King *Pu-nu*,-¹¹ nor are any of the later rulers represented. If the date, *c.* 460, usually assigned to this king were correct, his would be the only coins in the find of so late a period. On stylistic grounds such a date seems already too late, for the coin of Ialysus which provides the prototype, and the similar coin of Cyrene, must be dated round about 500.¹² Two overstrikes seem to clinch the matter; the stater of Salamis (no. 506, *Pl. XV.* 1) discussed above, and another of Idalium, no. 19 (*p.* 167, note). As the coin of Salamis has a smooth reverse and that of Idalium an incuse square, neither

¹¹ *B.M.C.*, *p.* 36.

¹² *B.M.C.*, *Caria*, *p.* 236; *B.M.C.*, *Cyrenaica*, *p.* xxxi.

can well be later than, say, 495; and whether the Paphian undertype is a coin of king *A* . . or king *Pu-nu*-, the two stand so close together that the second must begin in the eighties at latest. Among the uncertain coins the only plausible close dating is the year 498 suggested above for the staters imitating the cuttlefish type of Eretria (nos. 547-552, Pl. XVI. 6-7). But most significant of all is the evidence to be drawn from the coins of Citium. Although the hoard was unearthed on the ancient site of this city itself, it contained none of the inscribed coins of its rulers so common in the Dali hoard—not even of Baalmelek I, the beginning of whose reign is currently placed about the year 479. Although this evidence is only negative, in the special circumstances it is very weighty, and in view of the other indications we may assume that the hoard was buried at latest shortly after 480. In 479-478 the Greeks had swept the Persians out of the Aegean sea and were assuming the offensive again in Cyprus. Citium, the Phoenician city, was always the centre of the Persian interest, and with the other medizing towns an object of attack. In just such troubled times were hoards put away.

E. S. G. ROBINSON.

XV.

NOTES ON THE OXFORD COLLECTION.

(1) GREEK COINS OF NORTHERN ASIA MINOR.

(SEE PLATE XVII.)

DURING the preparation of the catalogue of Greek coins in the Ashmolean, some corrections of, and several additions to, the "Recueil Général" have been found: and, as there is likely to be some lapse of time before the Asia Minor volume is published, an account of these may be given in advance. At the same time the varieties which do not appear in the first part of the Berlin Corpus for Mysia are briefly described.

PONTUS.

KINGS. *Polemon II.*

QBACIAEΩCΠOΛEMΩNOC Head r. diademed.

CETOYC ΨΙ Head of Claudius r. laur.

AR √, 18 mm., 3.03 g.

This date is not given for type 29 in Rec.²

AMASIA. *L. Verus.*

The reverse legend of type 24 can be completed from the Oxford specimen as AMACMHTK ΠΡΩΤΗCΠONT: the obverse legend here is AYTKAICAA YPOHPΩCEB.

Sept. Severus.

CA Y·KAI·A·CEΠ· ΨCEOYHPOC Bust r. laur., back view.

QADPCEYANTAMACIACMTHNETPII Caracalla standing l. and Geta r., both togate, with r. hands clasped: in ex., ET·CΘ

Æ √, 31 mm., 13.99 g.

The legends of both obverse and reverse are varied from those of Rec.² 58.

AMISUS.

There are two names to be added to the list given for type 1.

OPXA MOY, to l. anchor. \mathcal{A} \rightarrow , 17 mm., 5.60 g.
[Pl. XVII. 1.]

(The name has been cut over another on the die, but the only original letter that can be read is Λ under the M.)

$\Psi\Upsilon$ $\Lambda\Lambda\text{O}$ \mathcal{A} \rightarrow , 20 mm., 5.63 g. [Pl. XVII. 2.]

It may be noted that there has been some duplication in the descriptions of the Oxford coins of Amisus in Rec.² Under type 1 the same coin is given as var. 33 and var. 101: the former is correct. Var. 38 of type 9 is the same coin as var. 16 of type 8: the legends are blundered and barbarous. Var. 2 of type 10 is really a var. of type 9, either 35 or 36, probably: the lower monograms are off the flan.

COMANA. *Gordianus III.*

QAYTKMANTΓOPΔIANOCCEB Bust r. rad., back view.

CIPOKAICA ΠPKOMANEΩN Emperor standing l.,

P

togate, holding in r. patera over altar: i. f. ET Π
 \mathcal{A} \downarrow , 36.5 mm., 26.41 g. [Pl. XVII. 13.]

This coin is interesting, not only as being some years later than any previously published for Comana, but as showing that the era had been changed from that used on the earlier coins, beginning in 34/5, to the normal one of Pontus Polemoniacus, beginning in 64.

GAZIURA.

A variant of type 4 has, on the obverse, the monogram Υ : it is of better style than the specimen illustrated in Rec.², and the figure of Baal holds in its hand an ear of corn as well as a bunch of grapes. \mathcal{A} \nearrow , 19 mm., 5.32 g.
[Pl. XVII. 3.]

NEOCAESAREA. *Sev. Alexander.*

CAVKMAYPCEO ΠAAEΞANΔPOC Bust r. laur., back view.

ζ[. . .]EOKE ΠCAMHTPO Four-legged table, on which are two prize-crowns, each with a palm in it: i. f.

above → ΙΕΡΟΥ, between legs → ΔΙΟΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ,
in ex. ΕΤΡΞΓ

Æ ↑, 29 mm., 13.46 g.

The legends of obverse and reverse are varied from those of Rec.² 42.

SEBASTOPOLIS.

The reverse legend of type 6 c can be completed from an Oxford specimen as ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟ ΝΗΡΑΚΛΕΩ ← ΠΟ

PAPHLAGONIA.

AMASTRIS.

The date Γ Μ is clear on the Oxford example of type 21 (2).

Caracalla. !

ΣΑΥΤΜΑΥΡΗΛΙΟΣ ΝΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΟΣ Bust r. laur., back
view. [Cmk. on neck Δ]

ΣΑΜΑΚΤΡ ΝΙΑΝΩΝ Winged Nemesis standing, head l.,
plucking at chiton with r. hand and holding bridle
in l.

Æ ↗, 24 mm., 5.41 g.

This is a variant of type 149 a.

CROMNA.

The following variants can be added to the list given under type 1.

Above, shrimp: on l., Γ: on r., nil. Æ ↑, 17 mm.,
3.58 g. [Pl. XVII. 4.]

Above, aplustre: on l., Γ: on r., Ο. Æ ↗, 15.5 mm.,
3.55 g. [Pl. XVII. 5.]

Above, crescent: on l., ~~ΣΕ~~: on r., star. Æ ↗,
16 mm., 3.56 g. [Pl. XVII. 6.]

GERMANICOPOLIS. *Gela.*

ΣΠΣΕΠΤΙ ΝΓΕΤΑΚ Bust r. bareheaded, back view.

ΣΓΕΡΜΑΝΙ ΝΚΟΠΟΛΕΩΣ Athene standing, head r.,
resting r. hand on spear, shield on l. arm.

Æ ↓, 22 mm., 7.50 g.

SINOPE.

A new name for type 22 is

ΘΕΟΓΕ ΑΒ ↓, 19 mm., 5.72 g.

The following coin presumably belongs to Sinope


l. √ C.F.I. r. ↑ Α· VIII Head of Julius r. laur.

bel. √ EX D.D. Two hands clasped, holding cornucopiae.

ΑΒ ↑, 25 mm., 11.44 g.

BITHYNIA.

KINGS. *Nicomedes II.*

There is a new variety of type 40 for year ZOP, with monogram : ΑΒ ↑, 37 mm., 16.77 g.

COMMUNE. *Claudius.*

A specimen of type 3 gives variant forms of the legends, though not complete, as

QTIKA ΑΡΣΕΒΓΕΡΑΥΤΟΚΜΕΓΔΕΠΠ
Head l. laur.



QΕΠΙΑΜΙΝΔΙΟΥΠΩΛ. [.]. ΘΥΠΑΤΟΥΠΑΤΡ
Head of city-goddess r., turreted.

ΑΒ ↑, 25 mm., 9.78 g.

Trajanus.

The obverse legend of type 27 can be completed as
QAYTONEPTPAIANOSKAIΣΑΡΣΕΒΑΓΕΡΜ

ΑΡΑΜΕΑ. *Caligula.*

The monograms in the field of the reverse of type 39 are clearly   on the Oxford specimen.

Agrippina sen.

QAGRIPPINACC[AESARIS]AVGM Bust r. draped.

QGENIVM QC.I.C Tyche standing l., holding rudder in r., cornucopiae in l. [Cmk. capricorn r.]

ΑΒ ↑, 18 mm., 3.32 g. [Pl. XVII. 7.]

Vespasianus.

QIMPVES[PASIA]NVSAVG Head r. laur.

CZMIN APOLLO Apollo standing r., wearing long robe, holding in r. plectrum, in l. lyre: i. f., below,
D D

Æ ↓, 21 mm., 5.21 g. [Pl. XVII. 8.]


Faustina.

FAVSTINAE AVGAVGPIIF Bust r. draped.

C C C APAMDD Nike advancing r., helmeted, holding palm in r., shield on l. arm.

Æ ↓, 26.5 mm., 11.22 g. [Pl. XVII. 10.]

CALCHEDON.

A variety of type 15 has, on l., , below, star of five points (14 mm., 3.47 g.)

Another new type is

Heads of Apollo, laur., and Artemis jugate l.

Prow l.: ab. → KAAXA bel. → ΔONION

Æ ↑, 18 mm., 4.31 g. [Pl. XVII. 9.]

Elagabalus.

CMAVPHANT ONINOC AVG Bust r. laur., wearing cuirass.

QKAAXAΔONION Herakles reclining l., head r., nude, holding kantharos in l. hand, l. elbow resting on rock covered by lion's skin: below, club.

Æ ↑, 29 mm., 11.32 g.

Sev. Alexander.

QMAVPCEVHAΛEΞANΔPOC AVG Bust r. laur., back view.

C KAAXAΔ O NION Tripod with lebes, serpent twined round one leg and extending head over lebes.

Æ ↓, 27 mm., 11.76 g.

CIVS.

A new name for type 4 is

ΦΙΑΙ ΝΟΣ R ↓, 12 mm., 1.20 g.

Macrinus.

QAVTKMOΓEΛCEOYHMAKPINOCAΥΓ Bust r. laur.,
wearing cuirass and cloak.

CKIA ZNON Youth seated r. on rock, tying sandal.

Æ ↑, 24 mm., 6.71 g.

This coin, from the Raye collection, was published by Wise (p. 73, Pl. XIV. 24), but it appears to have been overlooked in the *Recueil*.

CRETEIA. *Julia Domna.*

QIOYAIADOMNACEBACTH Bust r. draped.

CFAAO VIO ZΠO AITON ex. → KPHTIEON Tetrastyle
temple-front, within which figure standing l.

Æ ↑, 28 mm., 13.58 g. [Pl. XVII. 11.]

HERACLEA. *Trajanus.*

C.]TTPAIANOCK ZAIKAPCEBAΓEP[Head r. laur.

CHPAKΛEΩTAN ZMATPOΠOΛ[Poseidon standing l.,
himation on l. shoulder, holding dolphin on r.
hand, resting l. on trident.

Æ ↓, 21 mm., 4.36 g.

Geta.

C]CE ZΓETACAΥΓ Head r. laur.

CHPAKΛH ZACENΠONTΩ Infant Herakles kneeling r.
stifling a snake in each hand.

Æ ↑, 18 mm., 3.69 g.

This seems to be the type described as 147 under Geta Caesar in the *Recueil*.

NICAEA. *Antoninus Pius.*

A variant of type 78 has the head bare.

A variant of type 108 *bis* has a similar head, with the
legend CAVKTAIAΔP ZANTΩNEINOCCE

M. Aurelius.

A variant of type 139 has the bust l.

Commodus.

ΣΜΑΥΚΟΜ ΔΑΝΤΩΝΙΝΟC Head r. laur.

ΣΝΙΚΑ ΔΙΕΩΝ Athene standing l., resting r. hand on shield, l. on spear.

Æ ↓, 22 mm., 5.13 g.

Plautilla.

A variant of type 496 has the obverse legend ending -ΣΕΒ and on the reverse an altar to the l. of the figure.

Sev. Alexander.

ΣΜΑΥΡΣΕΥΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟCΑΥΓ Head r. laur.

ΣΝΙΚΑΙ ex. ΕΩΝ Lion walking r.

Æ ↓, 20 mm., 4.17 g.

Gordianus III.

Q[MAN]ΤΓΟΡΔΙΑΝΟCΑΥΓ Bust r. rad., back view.

ΣΝΙΚΑΙ ΔΕΩΝ Roma seated l., helmeted, holding on r. hand Nike r., resting l. on sceptre: by throne, shield.

Æ ↓, 24 mm., 5.92 g.

Philippus I.

QΜΙΟΥΑΙΟCΦΙΛΙΠΠΟCΑΥΓ Bust r. laur., back view.

ΣΝΙΚΑ ΔΙΕΩΝ Athene advancing r., helmeted, spear raised in r. hand, shield on l. arm.

Æ ↑, 30 mm., 9.10 g.

Treb. Gallus.

QΑΥΤΚΓΒΕΙΒΓΑΛΛΟCΑΥΓ Bust r. rad., back view.

ΣΝΙΚΑ ΔΙΕΩΝ Artemis advancing r., plucking arrow from quiver, bow in l. hand: at her feet, dog running r.

Æ ↙, 24.5 mm., 7.84 g.

Valerianus.

QΓΠΟΥΒΑΙΚΟΒΑΛΕΡΙΑΝΟCΑΥΓ Bust r. rad., back view.

ΣΝΙΚΑ ΔΙΕΩΝ Athene standing l., holding patera in r. hand, resting l. on spear: beside her, shield on ground.

Æ ↑, 28 mm., 8.99 g.

Gallienus.

A variant of type 846 has the obverse legend beginning ΠΟΛΙΚ-, on the reverse ΑΡΙΣΤΩΝ|ΜΕΓΙΣΤ|

NICOMEDIA. *Antoninus Pius.*

ΣΑΥΤΚΑΙCΑΡ ΨΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟC Head r. laur.

ΣΜΗΤΚΑΙΠΡΩΤΝ ΨΕΙΚΟΜΗΔΕΙ Hermes standing,
head l., holding purse in r. hand, caduceus in l.

Æ ↓, 19 mm., 3.62 g.

Otacilia Severa.

ΩΜΟΤΑΚΙΑΙΑCΕVHPAAV Bust r. draped.

ΣΝ ΙΚΟΜΗΔΕΝ ΨΔΙCΝΕΩΚΟΡΩΝ Athene standing,
head l., holding spear in r. hand, shield on l. arm.

Æ ↑, 26 mm., 9.22 g.

PRUSIAS. *Faustina.*

ΣΑΝΝΕΑ ΨΦΑΥCΤΙΝΑ Bust r. draped.

ΣΠΡΩVCIΕΩΝ ΨΠ ΡΟCΥΠΙΩ Hermes standing l.,
holding purse in r. hand, caduceus in l.: at his
feet, cock l.

Æ ↓, 17 mm., 4.41 g.

TRUM. *Julia Paula.*

ΩΙΟVΚΟΡΠΑVΛΑCΕΒ Bust l. draped.

ΣΤΙΑ ΨΝΩΝ Sarapis seated l., crowned with modius,
on high-backed throne, r. hand over Kerberos
seated at his feet, l. on sceptre.

Æ ↓, 25.5 mm., 8.17 g. [Pl. XVII. 12.]

MYSIA.

ADRAMYTTIUM.

Head of Zeus l., laur., hair long: b.d.

above → ΑΔΡΑΜΥ bel. → ΤΗ ΝΩΝ Rider on prancing
horse l., r. hand outstretched, cloak flying: i. f. l.



Æ ↑, 18.5 mm., 5.54 g.

A variant of types 11/14 of the Corpus.

Augustus.

ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΣ Head r. laur.

ΝΓΕΣΣΙΟΥ ΔΡ ΧΑΡΙΔΗΜΟΥ Head of Zeus l., laur.,
hair long: b.d.

Æ ↑, 17.5 mm., 5.25 g.

A brockage of a reverse with the same magistrate's name
reads

ΧΑΡΙΔΗΜΟΥ Δ ΓΕΣΣΙΟΥ Head of Zeus l. laur.,
hair long: b.d.

Æ 20 mm., 5.53 g.

Caracalla.

ΑΥΤΟΚΡ·ΚΑΙ ΔΜ·ΑΥΡΗ·ΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟC·ΑΥΓ· Bust
r., laur., wearing cuirass.

ΩΕΠΙCΤΡΜΑΡΚΙΑΝΟΝΒ·ΤΟΥΜΕΝΕΜΑΧΟΝΑΔΡΑΜΝ
inside CT ΗΝΩΝ Demeter seated l., veiled, on
throne, holding up corn and poppies in r. hand,
sceptre transversely in l.

Æ ↓, 31 mm., 17.49 g.

ΑΥΤΚΜΑΥΡ ΔΑΝΤΩΝΕΙΝΟ Bust r. laur., back view.
C

ΩΕΠΙCΤΡ ΠΑΙΛΙ ΔΕΥΤΥΧΟΝC ex. → ΑΔΡΑΜΝΥΘ|ΝΩΝ
Emperor standing l., in military dress, holding in
r. patera over altar, in l. spear, crowned by goddess
standing behind him, head l., holding end of her
peplos in l. hand.

Æ ↓, 37 mm., 24.27 g.

A variant of type 143 of the Corpus.

Gordianus III.

ΩΑΥΤ·Κ·Μ·ΑΝΤ·ΓΟΡΔΙΑΝΟC Bust r., laur., back view.

ΩΕΠΙC·ΚΛ·ΦΗ/ΛΕΙΚΟC·ΑΔΡΑΜΝ ins. ΔΤΗ ex. → ΝΩΝ
Demeter seated l., veiled, on throne, holding up
in r. hand corn and poppies, in l. sceptre trans-
versely.

Æ ↑, 39 mm., 24.65 g. [Pl. XVII. 15.]

APOLLONIA.

Bust of Artemis r., draped, with stephane, bow and quiver at shoulder.

1. ↑ ΑΠΟΛΛ[Ω] r. ↑ ΝΙΑΤ[ΩΝ] above → [ΡΥΝ] bel. → ΔΑ Flaming torch.

Æ ↑, 13 mm., 1.75 g.

A variant of type 206 of the Corpus.

Head of Apollo r. laur.

r. ↓ ΑΠΟΛΛΩ l. ↓ ΝΙΑΤΩΝ Apollo standing r., in long robe, lyre on l. arm.

Æ ↑, 21.5 mm., 6.93 g.

In style this is close to type 208 of the Corpus.

Trajanus.

ΣΑΥΝΕΡΤΡΑΙΑΝΟΝ ΣΚΑΙΣΕΓΕΡΔ Head r. laur.

ΣΑΠΟΛΛ·ΝΙ . . . Α ΣΠΟΡΥ . . River-god reclining l., holding reed in r. hand, l. resting on urn (?).

Æ ↑, 28 mm., 14.50 g.

L. Verus.

ΣΑΥΚΑΙΛΑΥΡΗ ΣΛΙΟΚΟΒΗΡΟC Bust r., bareheaded, back view.

ΩΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙΑΤΩΝΠΡΟCΡΥΝΔΑΚΩ Asklepios standing to front, holding out patera in r., resting l. on serpent-staff.

Æ ↓, 32 mm., 20.28 g.

ΑΤΤΑΕΑ.

ΣΤΥΧΗ ΣΠΟΛΕΩC Bust of city-goddess r., draped, with modius.

ΣΑΤΤΑ ΣΙΤΩΝ Athene standing l., holding in r. hand patera over altar, resting l. on shield.

Æ ↑, 22 mm., 4.50 g.

A variant of type 353 of the Corpus.

Trajanus.

ΣΑΥΤΝΕΡΒΑΚΑΙ ΣΤΡΑΙΑΝΟC Head r., laur.

ΣΕΠΑΝΘΚΟΔΡΑΤΟΥ ΣΑΤΤΑΕΙΤΩΝ Nude youth standing r., l. foot on cippus, both hands resting on l. thigh, serpent twined round cippus.

Æ ↑, 23.5 mm., 7.27 g. [Pl. XVII. 14.]

Plautilla.

ΟΦΟΝΑΒΙΑΠΛΑΥΤΙΑΛΛΑΚΕΒ Bust r., draped.

ΣΑΤ ΤΑ ΨΙΤΩΝ Homonoia standing l., holding in r. patera, in l. cornucopiae.

Æ ↙, 21.5 mm., 4.53 g.

This coin, from the Raye collection, was published by Wise as of Aegium, and he was followed hesitatingly by Mionnet, Suppl. iv. 29, 165: Wise misread the legend as ΑΙΓΑΙΑΤΩΝ, though Hearne, the first cataloguer of the Raye coins, had faithfully transcribed all he could see, ΑΙΓΑΙΤΩΝ: the tops of the second and third letters are weakly struck.

HADRIANOTHERAE.

ΣΙΕΡΑ ΨCVNKAHTOC Bust of Senate r., draped.

ΣΑΔΡΙΑΝ ΨΟΘΗΡΙΤΩΝ Asklepios standing, head l., r. hand on serpent-staff.

Æ ↓, 20 mm., 5.65 g.

A variant of type 550 of the Corpus.

J. G. MILNE.

MISCELLANEA.

THE EDLINGTON WOOD FIND.

IN January and February 1935, Mr. Colin Cameron and his family, of the Wood House, Edlington Wood, Doncaster, West Riding, Yorkshire, unearthed two deposits of Roman silver coins in Edlington Wood. One of these was lying in and around the fragments of a small beaker of Castor ware, and the other was found later a few feet distant, in association with fragments of a native pot of soft reddish brown calcitic ware, apparently hand made,¹ in which it had very probably been buried. At an inquest held by Mr. William H. Carlile, coroner for the West Riding of Yorkshire, the coins were declared to be Treasure Trove. They were, therefore, sent to the British Museum for examination. All the coins are now in the Doncaster Museum which purchased them.

The contents of the Castor ware beaker consisted of 80 denarii and 1 antoninianus, distributed over imperial personages as follows:

	Denarii.	Antoniniani.
Antoninus Pius	1	
Commodus	1	
Septimius Severus	16	
Julia Domna	4	
Caracalla	10	
Geta	2	
Macrinus	1	
Elagabalus	15	
Julia Maesa	8	
Julia Soaemias	3	
Severus Alexander	17	
Orbiana	1	
Maximinus Thrax	1	
Philip II. . . .	—	1
	<hr/> 80	<hr/> 1

¹ Information supplied by Mr. Philip Corder.

The classification of the coins under types is as follows:²

- Antoninus Pius. 1. C. 291. Worn.
 Commodus. 1. C. 574. Fairly well worn.
 Septimius Severus. 16. C. 37, 48, 68, 96 (2. var. *obv.* L SEPT SEV AVG IMP XI PART MAX), 210 (2), 283 (var. *obv.* SEP instead of SEPT), 311, 357 (3), 578, 592, 647 (2). Slightly worn—worn.
 Julia Domna. 4. C. 57, 150, 215, 246. Slightly worn—fairly well worn.
 Caracalla. 10. C. 165, 206, 242, 348, 413, 424 (var. *obv.* head laureate r.), 505, 574, 599, 632. Slightly worn—fairly well worn.
 Geta. 2. C. 44, 170. Slightly worn—fairly well worn.
 Macrinus. 1. C. 2. Slightly worn.
 Elagabalus. 15. C. 1 (2), 50 (var. *obv.* IMP ANTONINVS PIVS AVG. Bust laureate and draped r.), 61, 90 (var. *obv.* head laureate r.), 109, 154, 213 (2), 237 (var. *obv.* ANTONINVS P FEL AVG. Bust laureate and draped r.), 246, 256, 261, 276, 304. Slightly worn—fairly well worn.
 Julia Maesa. 8. C. 8, 34, 36 (3), 45 (3). Slightly worn.
 Julia Soaemias. 3. C. 8 (2), 14. Slightly worn.
 Severus Alexander. 17. C. 1, 23, 51, 187 (3), 197 (var. *obv.* head laureate and draped r.), 204, 231, 239, 270, 289, 351, 401, 566, 576, 578. Fine—fairly well worn.
 Orbiana. 1. C. 1. Slightly worn.
 Maximinus Thrax. 1. C. 31 (var. *obv.* bust laureate and draped r.). Slightly worn.
 Philip II. 1 (A).³ C. 57. Fine.

The second find consisted of 356 denarii and 172 antoniniani; distributed over imperial personages as follows:

	Denarii.	Antoniniani.
Septimius Severus	14	—
Julia Domna	2	—
Caracalla	13	—
Carried forward	29	—

² References are to Cohen, *Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'Empire romain*, vols. ii-v (1882, 1883, 1884, 1885).

³ A. = Antoninianus.

		Denarii.	Antoniniani.
	Brought forward	29	—
Geta		2	—
Elagabalus		86	2
Julia Maesa		29	1
Julia Soaemias		14	—
Julia Paula		3	—
Aquila Severa		2	—
Severus Alexander		150	—
Julia Mamaea		27	—
Maximinus Thrax		10	—
Maximus		1	—
Gordian III		3	62
Philip I		—	37
Otacilia Severa		—	5
Philip II		—	6
Trajan Decius		—	10
Herennia Etruscilla		—	5
Herennius Etruscus		—	2
Hostilian		—	2
Trebonianus Gallus		—	5
Volusian		—	8
Valerian		—	12
Mariniana		—	1
Gallienus		—	11
Salonina		—	3
		356	172
Total 528.			

The classification under types is as follows: ⁴

Septimius Severus. 14. C. 21 (2), 37, 109, 188, 315 (2), 357, 390, 442, 444 (2), 493, 761. Slightly worn—worn.

Julia Domna. 2. C. 21, 137. Slightly worn.

Caracalla. 13. C. 104, 128, 134, 154, 195, 224, 420, 447 (2), 464, 542 (var. *obv.* ANTONINVS PIVS AVG. Head laureate r.), 587, 689. Slightly worn—fairly well worn.

⁴ References are to Cohen, *Description historique des monnaies frappées sous l'Empire romain*, vols. ii-v (1882, 1883, 1884, 1885).

- Geta. 2. C. 83, 157. Slightly worn.
- Elagabalus. 86. C. 1 (6), 30 (3), 32 (2), 38 (3), 44 (2), 50 (2 var. *obv.* IMP ANTONINVS PIVS AVG. Bust laureate and draped r.), 61 (11), 68 (2), 70, 90, 92 (3), 109, 120 (3), 143 (2), 149, 151 (3), 154 (2), 184 (3), 189 (3), 195, 196, 196 (4 var. *rev.* COS III), 196 (var. *rev.* COS III. Bull instead of altar), 205, 213 (3), 242 (2), 256 (2), 261, 276 (5), 282 (2), 293 (2), 300 (7). Fine—worn.
- 2 (A.).⁵ C. 31 (var. *obv.* bust radiate and draped r.), 125. Slightly worn.
- Julia Maesa. 29. C. 8, 16 (2), 22, 29, 34, 36 (13), 45 (10). Fine—worn.
- 1 (A.). C. 30. Slightly worn.
- Julia Soaemias. 14. C. 8 (5), 14 (9). Slightly worn—fairly well worn.
- Julia Paula. 3. C. 6 (3). Slightly worn.
- Aquilia Severa. 2. C. 2 (2). Slightly worn.
- Severus Alexander. 150. C. 1 (3), 9 (5), 11 (with star on *rev.*), 23 (11), 27 (2), 29 (2), 32, 51, 52, 70 (3), 73 (3), 77 (2), 84 (2), 95, 108, 128 (var. *obv.* bust laureate and draped r.), 133, 147, 152 (2), 161 (2), 173, 183, 187 (3), 191, 197 (2 var. *obv.* bust laureate and draped r.), 204 (2), 204 (var. *obv.* head laureate r.), 207 (3), 215 (4), 218 (3), 223 (with star in field of *rev.*), 229, 231, 236, 239 (5), 249 (3), 251 (2), 256 (3), 260, 281, 289 (5), 305 (4), 312 (5), 315 (2), 319 (7), 325 (3), 337 (4), 346, 348, 351, 357 (2), 364 (2), 365, 388 (2), 409, 411 (2), 427, 434, 470, 501 (2), 508, 512, 528, 530, 543 (2), 560 (var. *obv.* bust laureate and draped r.), 563, 564, 576 (2), 578, 579, 585 (2), 586. Fine—fairly well worn.
- Julia Mamaea. 27. C. 5, 6 (3), 32 (2), 35 (10), 60 (2), 72, 76, 81 (6), 85. Fine—fairly well worn.
- Maximinus Thrax. 10. C. 7, 9, 31 (2), 37, 55, 77 (2), 85 (2). Fine—fairly well worn.
- Maximus. 1. C. 1. Slightly worn.
- Gordian III. 3. C. 39, 243, 325. Slightly worn.
- 62 (A.). C. 17 (3), 41 (6), 58, 61, 71, 81, 92, 97 (3), 98 (4 var. *obv.* bust radiate and draped r.), 105, 109 (4),

⁵ A. = Antoninianus.

- 121 (3), 133, 142 (var. *rev.* single cornucopiae), 155, 167, 196, 205, 216, 250 (2), 253 (2), 261 (2), 266, 296 (2), 299 (2), 302, 312, 313, 327 (2), 336 (2), 353 (2), 357, 381, 404 (4). Fine—fairly well worn.
- Philip I. 37 (A.). C. 9 (3. var. *rev.* AEQVITAS AVGG), 25 (5), 43 (2), 49, 80 (2), 87, 102, 124 (2), 136, 137 (2), 145 (2. A in field of *rev.*), 165 (4), 173, 178, 182, 193 (3), 198, 205, 209, 231, 240. Fine—slightly worn.
- Otacilia Severa. 5 (A.). C. 4 (3), 43, 53. Fine—slightly worn.
- Philip II. 6 (A.). C. 48 (4), 54 (2). One brilliant. Fine—slightly worn.
- Trajan Decius. 10 (A.). C. 2, 4 (var. *obv.* bust radiate and draped r.), 46, 49, 82, 86 (3), 105, 111 (var. *obv.* IMP C M Q TRAIANVS DECIVS AVG; bust radiate, draped and cuirassed r.). Fine—slightly worn.
- Herennia Etruscilla. 5 (A.). C. 17 (2), 19 (3). Fine—slightly worn.
- Herennius Etruscus. 2 (A.). C. 14, 26. Fine.
- Hostilian. 2 (A.). C. 15, 34. Fine—slightly worn.
- Gallus. 5 (A.). C. 13, 41, 67, 88, 103. Fine.
- Volusian. 8 (A.). C. 20, 25, 32, 71, 118 (2), 133 (2). One brilliant. Fine—slightly worn.
- Valerian. 12 (A.). C. 8, 17, 53, 65, 197, 230 (5). C. 5,⁶ 6.⁶ Fine—slightly worn.
- Mariniana. 1 (A.). C. 2. Fine.
- Gallienus. 11 (A.). C. 125, 129, 308 (3), 312 (var. *obv.* bust radiate, cuirassed and draped r.), 351 (2), 1051, 1309 (2). One brilliant. Fine—slightly worn.
- Salonina. 3 (A.). C. 60, 84, 115. Fine.

These two groups of coins were almost certainly parts of a single hoard which overflowed from the small Castor ware beaker into the larger pot. The unlikelihood of the contents of the beaker forming an independent hoard is suggested by the fact that the ten years subsequent to the reign of Severus Alexander are represented not by common issues of Gordian III and Philip I but by three comparatively

⁶ Listed by Cohen under Valerian II.

rare coins which were probably forced in after the beaker was already full.⁷

Treated as a whole the hoard begins with a worn coin of Antoninus Pius of A.D. 154, one of Commodus of A.D. 192, and covers the period from the beginning of the reign of Septimius Severus to the end of the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus, the latest coins being types dated by Webb⁸ to the years A.D. 258-9. The absence of issues of the sole reign of Gallienus establishes as the probable date of deposit the year A.D. 259. The coins in general are in good condition and from Elagabalus onwards include a number of fine specimens. This fact, taken in conjunction with the large proportion of early issues, suggests that the process of accumulation occupied a period of several years. The predominance of the denarius, too, makes it likely that the process began before that denomination was finally displaced by the antoninianus in the reign of Gordian III.

Hoard buried in the reign of Valerian and Gallienus are comparatively rare, the only possible British parallel being one discovered at Frampton in 1759, consisting of silver and small brass, "including almost a complete series from Antoninus Pius to Gallienus . . . supposed to amount to near 3,000 coins."⁹ Continental examples include, besides the Limoges hoard, one found at Signy l'Abbaye,¹⁰ one at Neuhofen¹¹ and two at Niederbieber.¹²

ANNE S. ROBERTSON.

⁷ The occurrence of a similar feature in the Limoges hoard of about the same date led M. Blanchet to suggest that another pot containing antoniniani of the Severi and later emperors had still to be found. *Rev. Num.*, 1927, pp. 113 ff.

⁸ Mattingly and Sydenham, *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, vol. vi, (Webb), p. 39, nos. 12, 13, p. 69, no. 17, p. 70, no. 18, and p. 72, no. 58.

⁹ Rudder's *Gloucestershire*, quoted in *Num. Chron.*, 1845, p. 195.

¹⁰ *Rev. Num.*, 1865, pp. 375 ff.

¹¹ *Mitt. d. Bay. Num. Ges.*, 1928, pp. 54 ff. This hoard was buried not later than A.D. 254.

¹² *Bonn. Jahrb.*, 107, pp. 95 ff. One consists of antoniniani alone, the other of denarii and antoniniani. Both were buried at the end of the joint reign of Valerian and Gallienus.

A NEW STERLING OF LORRAINE.



Obv. Head of king l., crowned ; sceptre in front.

✠ FERRICVS DEI GRAS

Rev. Long cross pommée with star in each angle.

LOM-TOM-REN-GIE

R .65 ; wt. 15.8.

The above coin is a denier esterlin of Duke Ferry IV, 1312-1328, of Lorraine, of a new type. Sterlings of the usual Edwardian type of this ruler are given by Chautard, *Imitations des Monnaies au type esterlin*, pp. 123-4, nos. 190 and 191, of which 190 has legends identical with the above coin. The types of this piece, however, are copied from the penny of Alexander III of Scotland and not from that of Edward I. Pennies of Alexander III are frequently found in hoards of sterling and must have been as well known in the Low Countries as the pennies of Edward. This, however, seems to be the first known specimen of a denier copied from the Scottish coin. The coin is in a private collection.

J. A.



1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



11



12



13



14



15



16



17



18




19





20















1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9



10



11



12





1



2



3



4




5



6



7



8



9



10





1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8





1



2



3



4



5



6



7



8



9




10



11




12



13



14



15

XVI.

THE ORIGIN OF THE ROMAN SERRATI.

WHY did the Romans issue serrate denarii? Did this grotesque device serve any specific purpose? Did it possess any particular significance?

These questions have received many widely different answers; and all manners of theories, some plausible, some fanciful, have been propounded to explain the Roman serrati. Light has been thrown on certain groups of serrati, secondary or incidental meanings have been suggested and, what is more to the purpose, an intelligible classification and scheme of dating has been drawn up,¹ yet the really important question of their original purpose and *raison d'être* still remains to be answered.

My aim in the following notes is to suggest an explanation which, I believe, goes to the root of the matter; and, although I claim no originality for the salient points on which the explanation is based, I believe it is the first time that these points have been marshalled into a connected line of argument.

Naturally one must begin by showing to what extent some of the existing views regarding the serrate denarii are now either untenable or inadequate.

¹ I refer particularly to Mr. Mattingly's article on the "Roman Serrati", *Num. Chron.*, 1924, pp. 31 ff. This contains much valuable material and is, to a large extent, the pioneer work on the subject. It is now more than ten years since it was written, and during that time our knowledge of the Republican coinage has made enormous strides. Hence several statements in the article require some modification. No one, I think, will endorse this more readily than Mr. Mattingly himself.

For example, Mr. Grueber comes to the conclusion "that the serrating of the coins (i.e. denarii) had no particular significance, but was only a fashion, which may have been considered ornamental and which was sporadic, occurring at certain epochs and then vanishing".²

From this view we must certainly dissent. We cannot seriously imagine that the Romans ever thought the serrated edge ornamental or in any way an embellishment to their coins. On the other hand, the process of serration must have involved considerable labour and it is impossible to believe that so much time and trouble should have been expended on a device that served no specific purpose.

Mr. Grueber, however, rightly points out that the purpose of serration was not "to prevent the clipping of coins, since the ragged edge would have lent itself more readily to this species of fraud than a plain one". Moreover, evidences of clipping are seldom, if ever, met with in denarii of the Roman Republic. Serration, therefore, was in no sense a crude form of milling.

It is evident, too, that the serrated edge was no safeguard against plated coins.³ This is proved conclusively by the frequency with which plated serrati occur.⁴ Even if, in the first instance, the device was adopted with this object, it is obvious that it would have been discontinued as soon as its uselessness was discovered. This, however, did not happen. Plated

² (*B.M.C. Rep.*, vol. i, p. 159.)

³ See "Nummi Serrati and Astral Coin types", E. J. Seltman, *Num. Chron.*, 1899; p. 322.

⁴ Perhaps it may be objected that plated serrati are not particularly common. But experience shows them to be far less

serrati certainly occur as far back as 115 B.C.,⁵ and we cannot imagine that they escaped detection for any length of time, whereas serrate denarii continue to be issued at regular intervals down to the time of Julius Caesar.

After all, if cuts in the edge were made in order to disclose the quality of the metal, a single notch would have sufficed, thereby obviating the tedious process of serrating the entire edge. We must, therefore, absolutely rule out the view that serration was devised as a means of detecting the quality of the metal.

An entirely different explanation has been proposed by Mr. Mattingly to the effect that the serrati represented the "good money" of the Marians to distinguish them from the non-serrate coins of the Sullans.

As a speculation this view is undeniably interesting, but it is obvious that it can only be applied to certain issues of serrate denarii and offers no solution to the problem why serrati were first introduced or what may be their meaning as a whole. Moreover, at certain points it is difficult to reconcile it with the facts of the coinage, if indeed it does not break down altogether.

For example, (1) there is no very clear evidence to

rare than was formerly supposed. Naturally large numbers of plated coins, serrate as well as non-serrate, must have been withdrawn from circulation. (This probably happened when Gratianus undertook to reform the currency.) To-day we only have those that happened to escape, and it is rather a matter for surprise that there are so many.

In order to show at a glance how large a proportion of serrate issues are known to occur as plated coins, in the classification of serrati given below, the plated examples are marked with an asterisk.

⁵ Plated examples of the Licinius-Domitius group (Cl. ii) are by no means rare.

show that the Marians ever regarded serrate coins with special favour, still less that they identified them with their party interests.

(2) It is only by the merest fiction that serrate denarii can be described as "good money" in contrast to the non-serrate, since they were not made of purer metal and were equally liable to plating.

(3) Three moneyers (excluding C. Talna) regularly strike both serrate and non-serrate coins. If the two species of coin denoted the interests of two parties as violently opposed to one another as were the Marians and Sullans, it is difficult to imagine how the same moneyer could strike coins for both. Whereas many instances might be quoted of a moneyer holding office at two different mints.

(4) That democratic movements happened to occur at periods when serrate denarii were issued need be no more than coincidence. But if the serrati were distinctively Marian coins we should naturally expect to find specially large issues of them at times when Marius was in power, as, for example, between the years 87 and 82 B.C., known as the Marian "reign of terror", when Marian absolutism was at its height. Yet, it is significant that during this period *no* serrate coins appear to have been issued.

The explanation of the serrati which I propose consists of two main points: (1) That, as a class, serrate denarii were designed for circulation outside Italy, more particularly in the Transalpine districts; and (2) that the purpose of the notched edge was, in the first instance, not so much to distinguish non-Italian from Italian issues, as to provide a species of coin that was generally approved by the Transalpine peoples,

especially the Galli and Germani. Having been accepted by them, serrati were issued at irregular intervals in the provinces down to the time of Julius Caesar.

Point (1) has already been anticipated by Babelon⁶ and by Mr. Mattingly in the last paragraph of "The Roman Serrati".

The assumption that serrate denarii were intended for Transalpine circulation does not preclude the possibility that some of them may have been struck in Italy; although it is certainly more natural to suppose that they were struck in or near the provinces in which they were intended to circulate.

In passing, it may be mentioned that Mr. Grueber, following de Salis, assigns only one serrate issue to a local mint (viz. the anonymous denarius with symbol, wheel; Class I), and assigns all the rest to Rome. This arrangement, if correct, practically rules out the view that the serrati were a provincial coinage. However, a more critical investigation of the question of mintage and the conditions under which the coins were struck will, I think, lead to a very different conclusion.

We need but slight acquaintance with the coins of the Roman Republic to be impressed with the great amount of variety in style and fabric which they present. Closer investigation shows how these variations and differences can be grouped together, and how one

⁶ "On peut conclure de là, avec toute certitude, que les deniers appelés *serrati* étaient spécialement frappés dans les provinces, et destinés aux relations commerciales avec les peuples barbares qui préféraient, du temps de Tacite, ces deniers aux autres, parce que c'étaient ceux-là surtout qu'ils avaient, de longue date, appris à connaître dans leurs rapports avec les Romains" (Bab. *Mon. Con.*, i, p. liii).

set of variants may be related to, or derived from, others. By this process we are in many cases able to separate the products of one mint from another, and to build up a relative chronology of issues. The whole subject is too complex, and entails far too close a treatment of details to be dealt with adequately in a paper such as this. But for our present purpose it will be sufficient to take one of the most obvious differences of fabric and apply it to the question under consideration.

Viewed generally, Republican denarii may be divided according to their fabric into two classes:

(A) Those that tend to have rather small compactly made flans; and (B) those with larger and thinner flans. This, of course, is merely a broad generalization and, for the time being, we must set minor details aside and the many variants that occur in these two main classes.

The important points to notice are:

(1) The two species of fabric *A* and *B* do not denote a development or periodical change in the fashion of the coins, but exist side by side throughout almost the whole of the Republican period. That is to say, the parallelism of *A* and *B* indicates the simultaneous, and more or less continuous, activity of two or more mints.

(2) The number of mints included under *A* and *B* varies considerably in different periods.

(3) As a general rule, the Roman mint keeps to the smaller fabric *A* for its coinage. This, of course, does not mean that all coins of fabric *A* belong to Rome. The flatter fabric *B* never seems to have been used at Rome, but is characteristic of coins struck elsewhere in Italy or in the provinces.

Although this is merely a very general summary of

a highly complex subject, a few illustrations will show how it is borne out in the coins.

Beginning at the latest period, when practically no doubt exists as to the mintage of the coins, we find under Augustus that the Roman coins, struck by the Senatorial moneyers, all approximate to the smaller fabric *A*. Whereas non-Roman coins, struck in Asia Minor, Gaul, and Spain, are normally of the larger fabric *B*.

The same phenomenon is observed in the preceding period in the coinage of Julius Caesar.

Tracing this parallelism backwards we find certain moneyers—(L. Calpurnius Piso is a good example)—who strike coins at two mints of fabrics *A* and *B*. Also we find a number of issues, or groups of issues, of fabric *B* that can almost certainly be assigned to non-Roman mints. A striking example is seen in the series of issues by the moneyers, L. Val. Flaccus, Mn. Aquilius, C. Fonteius, L. Memmius, L. Caesius, &c., shortly before 100 B.C. The coins of this group are of very distinctive style and are consistently of the larger fabric *B*. They are certainly non-Roman and belong to a south Italian mint, possibly Rhegium.

Mr. Grueber notes these differences of fabric and points out the significant fact that the serrate denarii belong entirely to the class with larger flans, which we have described as fabric *B*.

This general consideration of fabric, therefore, affords a *prima facie* presumption that the serrati were struck at provincial or at any rate non-Roman mints.

Next, by taking the serrate issues in detail, let us see how far other evidence corroborates this hypothesis.

CLASS I.⁷

Anonymous. *Obv.* Roma; *Rev.* Dioscuri, below, wheel.
(*B.M.C. Rep.* ii, p. 215.) FIG. 2 c.

This is the first regular serrate issue⁸ and is assigned by Mr. Grueber to a local mint; with which Mr. Mattingly agrees. The date hitherto given to this issue is much too early.⁹ Its style differs essentially from that of the earlier denarii with symbols, and approximates more closely to that of the Licinius-Domitius group (Class II). Evidently, therefore, it cannot be separated from the latter by any great length of time; and I suggest as a probable date 121-118 B.C., i.e. shortly after the victory of Q. Fabius Maximus over the Arverni. Its place of mintage will probably be the same as of Class II.

CLASS II.

(The asterisk denotes issues that are sometimes plated.)

M. Aurelius Scaurus.

*Porcius Licinius.

L. Cosconius M. f.

*L. Pomponius Cn. f.

C. Malleolus C. f.

These five moneyers strike the same types. *Obv.* Roma; *Rev.* Warrior (Bituitus) in biga. In exergue (on all issues) L•LIC•CN•DOM• (*B.M.C.*, i, p. 184 f.). Mr. Mattingly gives strong reasons for assigning this group to Narbo in Southern Gaul, 117-115 B.C.

⁷ I follow Mr. Mattingly's classification given in "The Roman Serrati", p. 33 ff.

⁸ For the present I omit reference to the irregular serrate issues of C. Talna, which are discussed in connexion with point 2.

⁹ See the revised system of chronology by Mattingly and Robinson in "The date of the Roman Denarius", *Proceedings of Brit. Acad.*, vol. xviii.

CLASS III.

*L. Aurelius Cotta. *Obv.* Vulcan; *Rev.* Eagle. (*B.M.C. Rep.*, i, p. 200.)

*C. Sulpicius C. f. *Obv.* Dei Penates; *Rev.* two soldiers. (*Ibid.* p. 202.)

*L. Memmius Gal. *Obv.* Saturn; *Rev.* Venus in biga. (*Ibid.* p. 204.)

L. Scipio Asiagenus. *Obv.* Jupiter; *Rev.* Jupiter in quadriga. (*Ibid.* p. 206.)

This group belongs to the period 104-101 B.C. We cannot accept the attribution of these coins to the mint of Rome, as suggested by Mr. Grueber and Mr. Mattingly, for the following reasons :

(1) On account of their fabric.

(2) The denarii of L. Aurelius Cotta are of unusually coarse style and seem to stand apart from other issues. Certainly they are quite unlike any coins that may reasonably be assigned to Rome at, or about, this period.

(3) There is some significance in the fact that the types of C. Sulpicius and L. Scipio Asiagenus occur in the curious class of coins generally known as "barbarous imitations". It is not always possible to determine the exact districts in which these barbarous coins were made, but there is no question that the barbarian imitators copied the coins of the Republic with which they were most familiar. Hence it is clear that the prototypes circulated freely in the provinces and, in all probability, were struck in or near the districts where the "imitations" occur.

CLASS IV.

*C. Mamilius Limetanus (82-81). *Obv.* Mercury; *Rev.* Ulysses. (*B.M.C. Rep.*, i, p. 343.)

- *Q. Antonius Balbus (81). *Obv.* Jupiter; *Rev.* Quadriga. (*Ibid.* p. 344.)
- L. Volteius L. f. Strabo (81). *Obv.* Jupiter; *Rev.* Europa on bull. (*Ibid.* p. 385.)
- *C. Marius C. f. Capito (80). *Obv.* Ceres; *Rev.* Colonist ploughing. (*Ibid.* p. 353.)
- *Ti. Claudius Ti. f. Ap. n. (79-78). *Obv.* Diana; *Rev.* Victory in biga. (*Ibid.* p. 381.)
- *A. Postumius A. f. S. n. Albinus (78). *Obv.* Diana; *Rev.* Sacrificial scene. (*Ibid.* p. 351.)
- *Obv.* Hispania; *Rev.* Togate figure. (*Ibid.* p. 352.)
- *L. Papius (78). *Obv.* Juno; *Rev.* Gryphon. (*Ibid.* p. 370.)
- *C. Publicius Q. f. (77). *Obv.* Roma; *Rev.* Hercules. (*Ibid.* p. 365.)
- *C. Naevius Balbus (77). *Obv.* Juno; *Rev.* Victory in triga. (*Ibid.* p. 366.)
- L. Procilius (76). *Obv.* Juno; *Rev.* Juno in biga. (*Ibid.* p. 387.)
- *Obv.* Jupiter; *Rev.* Juno standing. (*Ibid.* p. 386.)
- C. Egnatius Maxsumus (73). *Obv.* Venus; *Rev.* Libertas (*Ibid.* p. 399.)
- *Q. Crepereius M. f. Rocus (71). *Obv.* Amphitrite; *Rev.* Neptune. (*Ibid.* p. 408.)

There is, I believe, no question that Mr. Mattingly is right in assigning to Spain the issues of A. Postumius Albinus, C. Marius Capito, Ti. Claudius, C. Publicius, C. Naevius Balbus, Q. Crepereius Rocus, and possibly L. Papius. Since the types of Q. Antonius Balbus and C. Mamilius Limetanus occur among the "barbarous imitations" of denarii—the former being particularly common—we have a definite reason for including these two moneyers in the provincial list. Further, if we include Q. Antonius Balbus we must also include L. Volteius Strabo, whose coins are precisely similar in style. Strabo, it will be noticed, adopts a most unusual reverse type, Europa riding on a bull. The only other occurrence of this type on any issue of the

first century B.C., so far as I am aware, is on certain bronze coins of Castulo in Spain.¹⁰ Whether Strabo's denarii are in any way connected with the mint of Castulo must remain an open question. But the occurrence of so unusual a type on these two series of coins inclines one to think that there may be some sort of connexion between them.

We see, therefore, that of the twelve moneyers of Class IV, two only, L. Procilius and C. Egnatius, remain doubtful with regard to the mintage of their coins.

CLASS V.

Mn. Aquillius (71). *Obv.* Virtus; *Rev.* Aquillius and Sicilia. (*B.M.C. Rep.*, i, p. 416.)

*Kalenus-Cordius (69). *Obv.* Honos and Virtus; *Rev.* Roma and Italia. (*Ibid.*, p. 415.)

T. Vettius Sabinus (69). *Obv.* Tatiuss; *Rev.* Biga. (*Ibid.* p. 417.)

C. Hosidius Geta (68). *Obv.* Diana; *Rev.* Boar. (*Ibid.* p. 420.)

*L. Roscius Fabatus (64). *Obv.* Juno; *Rev.* Girl, feeding snake. (*Ibid.* p. 422.)

It will be seen that the types of these five issues are distinctly non-Roman in character, and Mr. Mattingly very aptly suggests that this group of serrati may represent the coinage circulated in Gaul during the earlier activity of Julius Caesar. In this case the dates of the first four issues may be slightly later than those here given.

From the foregoing survey it will be seen that we have definite reasons for assigning practically all the serrati issues to provincial mints. In a few cases the

¹⁰ However, the type of *Artemis Tauropolos* (on bronze of Amphipolis) is scarcely distinguishable from that of *Europa*.

mintage is doubtful, but in no single instance have we any grounds for assigning a serrate denarius to Rome.

We may conclude, therefore, that as a class the serrati were definitely intended for circulation outside Italy, more particularly in the Transalpine districts. Further, it will probably be admitted that this view of the serrati places them on an intelligible basis and removes many of the difficulties that hitherto seemed insurmountable.

Point (2). The purpose of the Republican government in issuing serrate denarii in the first instance was to provide a species of money that should be acceptable to the Transalpine peoples. That is to say, it was discovered that there was something in the look of a serrated coin that specially commended it to the native tribes.

Tacitus, in an oft-quoted passage, states that the Germani "*pecuniam probant veterem et diu notam, serratos bigatosque*".¹¹ Here we have a very precise piece of information, all the more important because it mentions details that no historian is likely to have hit upon by accident; and although it is only with a certain amount of reservation that the statement can be used as evidence of conditions that existed some two centuries before it was written, it nevertheless demands notice.

In the first place, it is important to note that Tacitus is not referring to the Germani as a whole but only to those tribes who inhabited the borderland near the Rhine (*proximi*). The tribes of the interior seem to have retained trade by barter down to the time that Tacitus wrote. The "borderers", on the other hand,

¹¹ Germania 5.

carried on considerable commerce with the Gauls. Hence we cannot reasonably limit Tacitus' remarks about coinage simply to the Germani proximi, to the exclusion of their western neighbours, who in course of time adopted native coinages of a similar character, and who are likely to have held similar views regarding money generally.

Clearly these Germani were suspicious of novelties in the matter of coinage. Their preference for *pecuniam veterem* does not imply any liking for coins in an old or worn condition, but for a coinage that was old established and with which they had become familiar (*diu notam*). This coinage, as we know, consisted of gold staters mainly of Philip II of Macedon and, to a less extent, of Alexander and Lysimachus. These were extensively imitated, usually in the crudest style, by tribes inhabiting Gaul and western Germany.

The traditional view regarding these native gold and electrum "imitations" was that they began quite early in the second century B.C. Fuller investigation, however, shows that it is impossible to reconcile so early a date with the evidence of the coins themselves, and Mr. G. C. Brooke has pointed out on overwhelmingly strong evidence that the staters of Philip (Philippi) were probably adopted as current gold coin by the Roman Republic and, under its auspices, were circulated in southern and central Gaul about the end of the second century B.C.¹² The Gaulish and Germanic imitations, therefore, cannot begin before 100 B.C.

¹² "The Philippus in the West", G. C. Brooke, *Num. Chron.*, 1933, pp. 98 ff. The conclusions regarding dating suggested in this article are of the highest importance. I would call special attention to the summary on pp. 136-8.

That is to say—and this is the important point—at the time that serrate denarii were introduced the peoples of Gaul and Germany were without a coinage of any kind.

That being so, the coins circulated by the Republic in the newly colonized Transalpine districts, being unfamiliar to the natives, were naturally viewed with suspicion. Confidence was, however, restored by the sight of the notched edge. Not because it offered any guarantee of the purity of the metal—a matter to which they seem to have attached very little importance, considering the debased state of their own coinages—but a guarantee of the purpose the coin was meant to serve. That is to say the serratus, by its very appearance suggested a medium of exchange already familiar to them.

In his monumental work, *Manuel d'archéologie*, Déchelette describes and illustrates a number of bronze amulets in the form of a disk or wheel (the latter being extremely numerous) discovered in Gaul, Spain, Britain, Hungary, Switzerland, and various parts of Germany, belonging to the Hallstatt and La Tène periods.¹³ These little wheel-amulets are undoubtedly charms or religious symbols, probably connected with sun-worship, and as such were recognized by all the Transalpine peoples. The circle, wheel, or disk, symbolize a solar cult that may be traced back through remote ages to the stone circles of neolithic times.¹⁴

¹³ *Man. d'arch.*, vol. ii, p. 415; vol. iii, p. 373.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* ii, p. 413. Hecataeus of Abdera refers to the Hyperboreans, a term applied generally to Celtic and Germanic peoples, as worshippers of the sun; and states that in Britain there was a magnificent circular temple of Apollo. Cf. Caesar, *De bel. Gal.*, vi. 22.

The wheel amulets vary somewhat in design. In some cases they are attached to fibulae (Fig. 1 c), or have chains for suspension and were probably worn round the neck. A particularly interesting variety of the later La Tène period shows a serrated edge, similar to that of a serrate denarius¹⁵ (Fig. 1 b). Others are




FIG. 1.

Reproduced from Déchelette, iv. 802-804. Wheel amulets from Stradonitz and Meuse (half actual size).

found strung together on a wire loop or bangle (Fig. 1 d), and Déchelette aptly suggests that they may have been used as a form of currency.¹⁶

¹⁵ "Il se peut, croyons-nous, qu'il y ait une relation entre les premières monnaies dentelées et les rouelles à dents de scie de l'époque La Tène, servant d'amulettes en même temps que d'instrument d'échange" (*ibid.* iv, p. 804). "Les roues dentelées figurées sur les vases peints de la Silésie à l'époque de Hallstatt, attestent la haute antiquité de cette représentation dans les pays germaniques" (*ibid.* cf. illustr., vol. iii, p. 309).

¹⁶ *Ibid.* iv, p. 802.

The fact that the wheel-amulets probably possessed a religious significance gives colour to the view that they also passed as money. The *Sacra Moneta* of Rome was but a survival of that aura of sanctity with which the Greeks from early times were wont to surround their coinage; and among the barbarous peoples of central Europe we find many religious conceptions running parallel with, and not infrequently derived from, those of the Greeks.

The term "bigati" may refer to either the denarius types of *Victory in biga* or *Dioscuri on horseback* or to the reverse type of the "Philippi" (gold staters). This is really immaterial. The important point being that the type represented *horses*. The preference of the Galli and Germani for horses is seen in the frequency with which the horse occurs as the reverse type on their barbarous and semi-barbarous coins. It would appear, too, that the horse possessed a religious, as well as a tribal significance.

Very commonly the horse is accompanied by a wheel, placed either above or below it. (FIG. 2.) Obviously the wheel is not a crude attempt to indicate a chariot, since in many instances where the draughtsmanship is fairly good, the wheel is placed above the horse; and sometimes it occurs in conjunction with other animals, such as a wild boar. We find, therefore, on these native coins a constant recurrence of the wheel-symbol that had previously appeared in the form of amulets.

The wheel on the coins, as in the case of the wheel-amulets, probably, therefore, possesses a double significance, first as a religious symbol and secondly as a sign denoting a medium of exchange.

The serration of coins was not a new device. We

find it on Carthaginian gold and silver coins of the third century B.C., and on bronze coins of the Seleucids and Philip V of Macedon early in the second century. In all these cases the reason for serration appears to have been symbolical rather than utilitarian; and



FIG. 2.

The wheel-symbol on coins of Gaul (*b, c, d*); and on a Pannonian "imitation" of Philip II. (*a*).

when we seek the reason that prompted the Romans to adopt this device, it will scarcely be a matter of surprise if it turns out to be much the same as that of the earlier serrati.¹⁷

Hence the natural hypothesis is that, in order to ensure the circulation of the Republican money in the Transalpine districts, the Romans made a concession to the religious susceptibilities of the native tribes by

¹⁷ See "Nummi Serrati and Astral Coin types", E. J. Seltman, *Num. Chron.*, 1899, pp. 322-43.

issuing a species of coin that suggested a resemblance to their serrate wheel-amulets. In so doing the Romans demonstrated their remarkable adaptive genius—ever ready to accede to local customs and prejudices, provided that by so doing they could attain some practical end.

Turning to the early Roman serrati we shall find one or two features that, in a remarkable way, confirm this view.

The earliest serrate denarii were struck by the moneyer, C. Talna, of whom nothing is certainly known, except that he cannot possibly be identified with the consul of 163 B.C., since his coins evidently belong to the period between 140 and 120 B.C. Unfortunately we cannot give a closer dating.

Normally Talna's coins are non-serrate; and his serrate denarii which are quite exceptional, have never so far been satisfactorily explained. Grueber dismisses them as "inexplicable". But, in view of what I have suggested, it seems perfectly reasonable to regard this exceptional serrate issue of C. Talna as an experiment to test the opinions of the Transalpine traders before the Republican government embarked upon the regular issue of serrate coins.

The first *regular* serrate issue, as all our authorities agree, is the anonymous (i.e. without moneyer's name) denarius of the traditional Roma-Dioscuri type, with the symbol, "wheel". (See above Class I.) If our theory of the origin of the Roman serrati is correct, this is precisely the type we should expect to find on the inaugural issue. Here combined are all the elements calculated to satisfy Gaulish tastes; the notched edge, reminiscent of their serrated amulets, a reverse

type with horses and, above all, their familiar "wheel" symbol.

Before leaving our consideration of Point 2, I want to suggest an answer to the question which naturally presents itself—if the purpose of serrating denarii was, in the first instance, a concession to the tastes of the Galli and Germani, how is it that these peoples never issued serrate coins of their own?

The answer will, I think, be evident if we recall the dates and general conditions of the native coinages.

(1) The romanization of Gaul began with the victory of Q. Fabius Maximus over the Arverni in 121 B.C., shortly after which we may reasonably place the first regular issue of serrate denarii (Class I), and a few years later, c. 117–115 B.C., the Licinius-Domitius group (Class II). At this time the Galli and Germani possessed no coinages of their own and their only medium of exchange, so far as has been ascertained, consisted of rings and wheel-shaped amulets. Hence the coinage introduced by the Republic into the Transalpine districts was serrated in order to suggest a resemblance to the medium of exchange already familiar to the natives.

(2) Towards the end of the second century B.C. "Philippi", adopted as a gold currency by the Republic, began to circulate in Gaul. (See Mr. Brooke's article, *op. cit.*) These gold coins evidently found great favour with the native tribes, who began to make crude imitations of them in gold and electrum. These "imitations", which are the earliest coins issued by the Transalpine tribes, do not begin before 100 B.C. and, as Mr. Brooke shows, belong for the most part to the middle of the first century B.C. Being merely

imitations of an existing coinage, the edges of the coins are naturally not serrated. But instead we find the wheel-motive introduced, almost universally, as part of the design.

(3) The small silver coins, mainly imitations of Republican denarii, issued by the Galli and Germani, are probably in no case earlier than the time of Caesar, and for the most part belong to the period after 30 B.C. By this time the practice, as well as the purpose, of serration had become obsolete. Hence we should not expect to find a revival of it.

It will readily be seen that the view which I have suggested regarding the origin of the Roman serrati offers a reasonable explanation of the exceptional serrate issues of C. Talna and the first regular serrate issue with the "wheel" symbol; both of which have hitherto been regarded as unsolved problems. Further, it may be fairly claimed that the explanation of the general purpose of the serrati not only places this particular coinage on an intelligible basis but helps considerably towards our understanding of the Republican coinage as a whole. That is to say, by separating off all the serrati as provincial or, at any rate, non-Roman issues, the way is made clear for a more exact classification of the non-serrate issues in relation to one another. Hence an important step is made towards determining the mintage of the coins; and, although at present the problem bristles with difficulties, we may yet feel hopeful of its ultimate solution.

In conclusion, I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. L. A. Lawrence for the help he has given me by way of supplying material for study, and for

suggesting practical points which he and I have thrashed out in the course of friendly debate.

Abnormal serrate denarii.

The occasional occurrence of serration on coins which normally have smooth edges calls for some notice. So far the following examples have been recorded:—L. Appuleius Saturninus, type as *B.M.C.*, i. 1551, but with S under horses on reverse (Lawrence Coll.); M. Sergius Silus, noted by Bahrfeldt as being in the Gotha collection (*Num. Zeit.*, 1897, p. 73); L. Piso Frugi and M. Cordius Rufus (referred to by Mr. Mattingly in "Serrati", p. 33).

With regard to the denarius of L. Appuleius Saturninus there appears no doubt that the serration was made in the edge *after the coin was struck*, which proves conclusively that the coin was not issued intentionally as a serratus. Consequently, as it may have resulted merely from the caprice of some individual, it has no real bearing on the question of serrate coins.

No details are given as to the method of serration in the case of the Gotha coin of M. Sergius Silus. But in referring to it Mr. Grueber says "this piece, though ancient, may be a forgery" (*B.M.C.*, ii, p. 269).

The same probably holds good of the denarii of L. Piso Frugi and M. Cordius Rufus. But as the whereabouts of these coins is not stated a definite opinion regarding them is impossible.

Method of serration.

As many writers seem content to leave it an open question as to how the notched edge was produced, the following conclusions, as the result of examining several thousand serrati, may be worth noting:

(1) The notches were made in the metal blank *before* the coin was struck. Dr. G. Macdonald, *Evolution of Coinage*, p. 69, states precisely the opposite. Bahrfeldt thinks the flans may have been treated either before or after striking (*Berliner Münzblätter*, 1904, p. 441). But careful examination of the burr, which invariably occurs on the inner edges of the notches, shows that the latter could not possibly have been made *after* striking.

(2) The notches were made with a sharp-cutting tool such

as a cold-chisel or adze. Their inner surfaces show quite conclusively that they were not made with a saw or file.

(3) The irregularity in the spacing and depth of the notches leaves no doubt that the operation was carried out by hand. Here, in passing, it may be mentioned that the curious specimen of false coin-dies in the British Museum showing the serrated edge cut into the die itself, is merely an ingenious "fake". Such a method of production where loose dies are used is obviously impossible. But the maker of this original forgery (which, by the way, is of bronze) does not seem to have troubled to find out whether or not such an appliance could actually be used.

E. A. SYDENHAM.

NOTE ON SERRATED COINS.

The question of the serrati is intimately connected with the manufacture of the coins, and there are two points to consider: (1) plating; (2) when the serrations were made. Now as to plating—are we to consider plated coins, whether serrate or not, as original? In other words are they official products made in the mint? There would seem to be but little doubt that this was the case, as identical coins, plated and not plated, are known from the same die or dies—and of the same style and workmanship as the other coins of the same series. If we admit as official a good silver coin we can hardly fail to admit that its plated brother is good also. It would be another matter if all plated coins were of bad or indifferent workmanship compared with the corresponding silver coins. The discovery of plated and non-plated coins from the same dies should set the question of genuineness at rest.

Experiments kindly carried out at the Royal Mint show that the manufacture of plated struck coins is quite simple and could have been carried out in Republican and later times with ease. The plating is done *before* the blank is put under the dies, and though easier to accomplish with quite a moderate heat it has been done cold. In the latter case the blank is wrapped in silver foil in such a way that the join is not on the edge. The pressure of the dies in striking seems to leave no trace of the folding over. Coins to be serrated cannot be done in this way, and heat is required to melt the silver into the interstices of the serration. The serrations were made *before* plating as is shown by the silver coating in the grooves. It follows that they must have been

serrated and plated before striking otherwise the base metal would be visible where the cuts were made. With all this in view it seems most unlikely that serration was done with a view to proving the coin of good silver. If the serration had been done after striking perhaps something might have been said for the idea, but nearly all these coins are clearly serrated before being struck as the position of the burrs tells us. One other point: there would have been no necessity to serrate all round to show a coin was not plated when one or two nicks would have served the purpose and have saved much labour. It is interesting to note that plated serrati are now known by most of the moneyers in the lists given by Mr. Mattingly and Mr. Sydenham, and several specimens by the same moneyer are also known.

Although quinarii and solidi, as well as denarii, are sometimes plated, why is it that only denarii are serrated?

L. A. LAWRENCE.

XVII.

A NOMISMA OF ANDRONICUS III, ANNA AND JOHN V.



Obv. AN I[̄C] Andronicus III kneeling before
 Δ X[̄C] Christ.
 P I
 N
 K

Rev. ΔΔΔ on l.; r. illegible. Anna of Savoy standing
 facing on l. with John V.

IN recent years foreign numismatists have displayed a good deal of interest in the coinage which centres round the figure of Anna of Savoy, wife, and widow, of the Emperor Andronicus III, and Regent during the minority of their son, the Emperor John V. The above illustration adds one more to the few already published of the scarce nomisma which has been variously attributed to Andronicus II, with Irene and Andronicus III; Andronicus II, with Irene and Michael IX; Andronicus II, with Anna of Savoy and Andronicus III; Andronicus III, with Anna of Savoy and John V; and, finally, to Andronicus III, with Anna of Savoy and John VI.

It may be well to recall that the Emperor Andronicus III married, as his second wife, Jeanne, daughter of the Count of Savoy, who, on her marriage, took the name of Anna, and figures largely in the history of the period. On the death of her husband in 1341 the Empress Anna became Regent for her nine-years-old son, John V. The occasion let loose a number of conflicting interests, the late Emperor's Prime Minister, John Cantacuzenus, a Court financier named Apocaucus, and the Patriarch John, being the principal aspirants to the Empress's favour. With marked skill she played one off against the other until at length she found it necessary to accord to Cantacuzenus the title of Grand Domesticus, and to give him command of the army in Thessaly. But, with his rival removed to a distance, Apocaucus was able to press his claims with such insistence that, in order to propitiate him, Anna had to grant him the dignity of Grand Duke and Prefect of Constantinople. This was an ill-advised step, for it brought Cantacuzenus into open rebellion. His adherents rallied round him and proclaimed him Emperor at Didymoteichus under the style of John VI, and the land was plunged into civil war. In the summer of 1345 Apocaucus was murdered, and less than two years later Anna made the fatal mistake of quarrelling with the Patriarch John, to whose advice, whatever his private motives, she owed much. This gave Cantacuzenus the opportunity for which he had waited, and which he was not slow to seize. On 2 February 1347 the Empress convoked a gathering of bishops and monks, and deposed the Patriarch, but that very night Cantacuzenus seized the capital and put himself in a position to dictate his own terms.

This he seems to have done with moderation, and an agreement was come to under which, while respecting the positions of the Empress and Emperor, the control of the Empire was to be entrusted to Cantacuzenus for ten years, after which it was to be relinquished to John V. It was also arranged that the young Emperor should marry Cantacuzenus's daughter, Helena, then aged thirteen. It is unnecessary for our present purpose to follow the fortunes of the youthful couple; they had no practical share in the government, nor would the Empress Anna seem to have had, except in so far as the new Emperor chose to take her into his counsels. In 1351, however, matters again came to a head between the two Emperors; John V enlisted the services of the Kral of Servia, and civil war again broke out. After varying fortunes the tide eventually set against Cantacuzenus, and in 1354 he abdicated, retiring into a monastery, where, as the monk Joasaph, he spent the remainder of his life compiling the history of his times which, in spite of its untrustworthiness, remains one of our principal sources of information.

We first meet with an illustration of the above nomisma in Sabatier's *Monnaies Byzantines* (Pl. LXI, fig. 13), where it is attributed to Andronicus II, Irene, and Andronicus III. Sabatier says (ii, pp. 256, 257):

Il y a deux ans, j'ai tenu entre les mains deux sous d'or concaves qui m'ont été communiqués par M. H. Hoffmann et qui depuis ont passé, je crois, dans la collection du Musée britannique; l'or du flan de ces monnaies est un peu rougeâtre et m'a paru n'avoir pas toute pureté. Sur l'exemplaire le mieux conservé, on voit d'un côté le nom et l'effigie d'Andronic II; le revers est occupé par deux personnages, dont celui de gauche est évidemment le petit-fils du vieil empereur, puisque son nom abrégé (ΑΝΔ) est inscrit à ses côtés. Quant au troisième personnage, qui me paraît être une femme, et dont au reste le

nom a dû également être inscrit à côté de son effigie, ce ne peut être, à mon avis, que l'impératrice Irène, femme d'Andronic II, attendu que Irène de Brunswick, épouse d'Andronic III, était morte en 1324, un an avant que son mari ne montât sur le trône.

The two coins illustrated in the *Catalogue of the British Museum* (Pl. LXXV, figs. 3 and 4) are the identical two referred to by Sabatier, and are attributed by Mr. Wroth to Andronicus II, Irene, and Michael IX. On no. 3 the Empress is on the left; on no. 4 on the right. In a note in the text (pp. 620, 621) Mr. Wroth says:

No. 24 (i.e. fig. 3) is the identical specimen described and engraved by Sabatier in *Revue belge*, 1859, p. 317, and (with a variation in the reading) in his *Description*, ii, p. 257, no. 34. I cannot agree with him that the *rev.* reads on the l. ANΔ and on the r. Θ[·PHN]? The letters on the left are thick and blurred, possibly ΙΘΕ as I have suggested. The letters on r. may be intended for MIX, a reading first adopted by Sabatier in the *Revue belge* (*l.c.*). Another specimen in Photiades *Cat.*, no. 602 (not described); another in Moustier *Cat.*, no. 4159, described as of "Or rouge", no doubt gold much alloyed with copper, like our no. 25. The issue of this family type probably took place at the coronation of Michael IX in May 1295.

In the catalogue of the "Foreign Prince" sale (Glen-dining, 1922) there appeared two examples of the nomisma, of which one only was described and illustrated (Pl. II, fig. 257). The coins were attributed to Andronicus II, Irene, and Andronicus III, the compilers stating that the coin illustrated corrected the reading of the *British Museum Catalogue* and clearly showed the third figure to be Andronicus III, and not Michael IX.

Thus stood our knowledge at the time I was engaged upon that part of my Handbook which relates to the period in question. With the evidence of the "Foreign

Prince" coin before me I ventured to reject Mr. Wroth's attribution to Andronicus II, Irene, and Michael IX, and also that of the "Foreign Prince" catalogue, and on p. 333, for reasons there given, to suggest the attribution to Andronicus II, Anna of Savoy, and Andronicus III. Before the final publication of my work, however, Sig. Bertelè kindly informed me of the find of silver coins (aspers) which had come into his hands, and I was able to insert a "Correction" removing the coin to Andronicus III, Anna of Savoy, and John V.

Then followed Sig. Bertelè's paper in the *Proceedings* of the Istituto Italiano di Numismatica (vol. vi, 1930), giving a detailed description of his find. He divides the coins into three groups:

(A) Andronicus III alone.

(B) Andronicus III, Anna, and John V.

(C) Anna and John V.

On the *obv.* of (A) we have Andronicus III and St. Demetrius standing facing, with Christ seated on the *rev.*

On (B) we have Andronicus III kneeling before the Virgin, with Anna and John standing facing on the *rev.* This is practically the type of the nomisma, except that the Virgin takes the place of Christ, probably owing to some fanciful connexion between the metal and the Virgin, rather than to any special predilection of the Emperor for "the Mother of God". On none of Sig. Bertelè's coins of this type does the Emperor appear on the left.

There are two varieties of (C). On the *obv.* of both Anna and John stand facing. On the *rev.* of one variety we have Christ seated, but on the other St. Demetrius and the Virgin standing facing.

Since the publication of Sig. Bertelè's paper Dr. Henry Longuet has questioned (*Revue Numismatique*, 1933, p. 135) his identification of the John on the coins in all cases with John V, holding that, where the figure appears in the inferior position (i.e. the spectator's right), the Emperor represented is John VI, Cantacuzenus, and not John V. Dr. Longuet gives two illustrations of the nomisma, one from our British Museum coin (*B.M.C.*, Pl. LXXV. 4), the other from a specimen in the French Cabinet of the coin figured above. After expressing his concurrence in Sig. Bertelè's identification of Andronicus IV and Anna of Savoy, he proceeds (p. 137) :

Mais je ne crois pas que cet empereur du nom de Jean soit, dans tous les cas, Jean V, Paléologue, comme le pense M. Bertelè. Si certaines de ces monnaies doivent bien être attribuées à ce dernier empereur, je pense que la majeure partie doit en être restituée à Jean Cantacuzène.

Il existe, en effet, parmi ces pièces, deux variétés se distinguant l'une de l'autre par la position réciproque de l'impératrice Anne et de l'empereur Jean. Sur certaines d'entre elles, les moins nombreuses, l'empereur est à la droite de l'impératrice. Les autres nous présentent une ordonnance contraire : l'impératrice est à droite et l'empereur à sa gauche.

Dr. Longuet then gives historic grounds for believing the likelihood of Cantacuzenus assuming the inferior position to the Empress Anna, and he contends that, where this is found on the coinage, the John represented is John VI, and not John V.

Now the first question which presents itself to us is whether or no the coin bearing the effigy of Andronicus III was struck in the lifetime of that Emperor. If it was, Dr. Longuet's theory falls to the ground, for Cantacuzenus did not assume the purple until after the death of Andronicus III. He might be able to

advance it in respect of the subsequent issues, but unfortunately he has laid great stress upon the interchange of positions of the Empress and John upon the two nomismata in the British Museum. It seems to me, however, that it is still open to him to revise his acceptance of the second of these coins as a coin of Andronicus III, Anna, and John. But Dr. Longuet has apparently no doubt as to the posthumous nature of the coins, and he sees conclusive evidence of it in the presence of an "Emperor John", rightly pointing out that there was no Emperor of this name in existence during the lifetime of Andronicus III. But is he right in assuming that the John on the coin is an "Emperor"? Might not Andronicus III have placed his wife and his heir upon a late issue of his reign? Dr. Longuet would say that we have no precedent for the appearance of an uncrowned personage upon the Byzantine coinage. I am not sure that this would be strictly correct. Have we satisfactory evidence that the younger sons of Eudocia Makrembolitissa were ever crowned? They appear with their mother and eldest brother, Michael VII, on a nomisma of Romanus IV. Dr. Longuet is of opinion that if the coins had been issued in the lifetime of Andronicus III, his son John would have been represented as a child, or youth at best, seeing that he was only nine years old at his father's death. But this is a refinement of detail which the art of the period would hardly warrant us to expect. I am by no means certain, however, that a proportionate representation has not been attempted on the specimen illustrated above. The figure of John is decidedly shorter than that of the Empress, and in this respect my coin seems to differ from others

hitherto published. But if a youthful representation is to be called for in the case of John V, how is a beard to be dispensed with in the case of John VI? And yet none of the known coins show the figure of John with a beard. Personally I find it less difficult to believe that Andronicus III placed effigies of his wife and his heir on one of his coins, even though the latter had not then been crowned, than that the effigy of the deceased Emperor was retained upon the coinage of his successor, a practice unknown to the Byzantine coinage since the reign of Constantine V, nearly six hundred years before. Further, it must be remembered that a space of about five years would have intervened between the death of Andronicus III and the reconciliation with Cantacuzenus, the period to which Dr. Longuet would assign the issue of the coin. What need would there then have been to revive the memory of the late Emperor?

If we could dispose of the second nomisma in the *B.M.C.*, Dr. Longuet's theory would certainly be attractive, but while the attribution of this coin remains unchallenged, I do not see how the theory can be accepted.

Dr. Longuet seeks further confirmation of his view in the presence of St. Demetrius and the Virgin on the second variety of Sig. Bertelè's last group. He quotes Sig. Bertelè as calling attention to the hitherto unknown association of the Virgin and St. Demetrius on the Byzantine coinage, and to the correspondence of their relative positions to those of the imperial personages on the other side of the coin, i.e. the Virgin behind the Empress, and the Saint behind the Emperor, and he infers from this an intentional connexion

between the John on the obverse and the Saint on the reverse, and Cantacuzenus, he tells us, had "*une dévotion toute particulière*" for St. Demetrius. In the non-military garb of the Saint he sees, too, a connexion between the city of Thessalonica, its saint, and Cantacuzenus, the friend of both. The fact, however, must not be overlooked that on the asper of Andronicus III alone, St. Demetrius has already appeared, and in exactly the same non-military attire.

HUGH GOODACRE.

XVIII.

SOME RECENT ORIENTAL COIN ACQUISITIONS OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM.



[SEE PLATE XVIII.]

LARGELY through the generosity of Dr. C. Davies Sherborn, the Department of Coins and Medals has obtained several oriental coins that are, for the most part, of extreme rarity and importance. They range in date from the beginning of the Sassanian Empire down to the times of the 'Abbāsid Caliphs, and provide welcome additions to the National Collection. The outstanding pieces, which possess many new features, and in one or two cases are unique, are recorded here.

Sassanian.




(a) Shāpūr, son of Pāpak (A.D. 211-12).


1. R. 9; wt. 64.4 grs. (4.17 grms.). [PL. XVIII. 1.]

Obv. Head of King facing l., bearded, with flowing hair at back, and wearing diademed head-dress, with crescent at the side, and ear-flap; legend r. downwards,  MLKA (King), l. upwards retrograde  SHAPUR (Shāpūr); all within circle of dots.

Rev. Smaller head of King facing l., bearded, and wearing small diademed head-dress surmounted by globular adornment; legend r. downwards and l. upwards as on obv. with but slight variations in the engraving; all within circle of dots.

This is a drachm of the ill-fated Shāpūr, son of Pāpak, the founder of the fortunes of the dynasty of Sāsān. No coins of the father are known, and it is not

rows of pearls at bottom, and surrounded by pointed "flame halo"; breast ornament ; legend, r. downwards (*sic*)  AIRAN AFZUTAN . . . (?) l. downwards, the date  SHSHSIH (36 = A.D. 625); all within double circle; outside, six-pointed star and crescent in each quarter; additional outer circle, partly effaced.²

The date of this remarkable coin is one year earlier than the well-known specimen in the Vienna Cabinet (wt. 61.92 grs.), which has been the subject of some discussion by oriental numismatists during the past century.³ There is a still earlier example, however, which was bought by the British Museum in 1895 from Gen. A. Houtum-Schindler, and which has never, so far as I am aware, been published. It is dated  SHSHVIST (26). For purposes of comparison it is therefore reproduced here. [PL. XVIII. 3]. It is unfortunately pierced in two places, but not in such

² Cf. the coins of Bishr ibn Marwān and Hajjāj ibn Yūsuf for a similar additional circle, *Num. Chron.*, 1934, p. 285.

³ The principal references are as follows:—Sir W. Ouseley, *Observations on some Medals and Gems bearing inscriptions in the Pahlavi or ancient Persick Character*, London, 1801, pp. 32 ff., plate no. 8; A. de Longpérier, *Essai sur les médailles des rois perses de la dynastie sassanide*, Paris, 1840, p. 78 (Pl. XI, no. 3, reproduced from Ouseley); A. D. Mordtmann, in *ZDMG*, 1854, pp. 138-9 (reference only); E. Thomas ed. Prinsep's *Essays*, London, 1858, ii, pp. 114-15 (reference only). Alex. Cunningham, *Archaeological Survey of India Report*, Calcutta, 1875, vol. v, pp. 122-3, pl. XXXVII, no. 2. (Longpérier's reproduction) also *Num. Chron.*, 1894, pp. 290-1. Ed. Drouin, "Observations sur les monnaies à légendes en Pehlvi et Pehlvi-Arabe" in *Revue Archéologique*, Paris, 1885, pp. 158-60, pl. XVIII, no. 6 (a better reproduction from tin foil impression of the original in Vienna); and F. D. J. Paruck, *Sāsānian Coins*, Bombay, 1924, p. 115, pl. XXI, no. 463 (from a cast of the original). I am indebted to Direktor A. von Loehr of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, for the courtesy of a cast for purposes of study.

a way as to interfere with the legends to any great extent.

There can be no doubt that the obverse of these coins is meant to depict Khusrau II "King of Kings" (*Malkān malkā*). The winged head-dress indicates that. The problem arises, however, as to the correct interpretation of the figure and legend on the reverse. The date in each case is certain (26 and 36⁴ on the B.M. specimens, and 37 on the one in Vienna). The legend on the right, however, has presented some difficulty, Ouseley (p. 33) read the first word as *Airān*, i.e. *Īrān*, the old, and the recently revived, name for Persia. An alternative suggestion put forward by him was that it might indicate the name of Irene, the daughter of the Byzantine emperor Maurice Tiberius, whom Khusrau II had married; or else that of Shīrīn, the favourite mistress of that monarch. The Pehlevi characters might suit either rendering. If that were so, then the figure on the reverse would be a representation of the Queen with her hair curiously coiffured, or else wearing one of those extraordinary head-dresses so favoured by Sassanian royalty. The fact, too, that the face is beardless would help to support this theory. Cunningham, however, in 1875 (*ibid.* p. 123) advanced the opinion that it represented the Indian Sun-god of Multān with rayed head-dress "arranged after the Indian fashion and quite different from the head-dress of the Persian *Mithra*". He based his opinion on the fact that a similar bust occurs on a series of Indo-Scythian coins bearing the names of Shāhi Tigīn and Vasu

⁴ A duplicate of the latter has recently been acquired by the American Numismatic Society, making the fourth example known of this peculiar type.

Deva who are said to have ruled at Multān (probably in 6th or 7th century A.D.). While it is unlikely that Multān has anything to do with it, the figure is certainly more likely to be a youthful representation of a solar deity, from the fact that it occupies the position on the reverse of the coin of the customary fire-altar with attendant priests, and also because of the peculiar "flaming halo" that surrounds the crowned head. But there is no reason to suppose that it is the particular solar deity whose temple or "house of gold" (دار الذهب) at Multān is frequently mentioned by oriental historians.⁵ In fact, the name *Airān* would rather suggest that we have here a tribute to the sun-god of Īrān, and that the remainder of the legend contains some invocation for prosperity. The first part is certainly the verb *arzūrān* (*to increase*) and that is as far as I venture to read with any confidence, though the remaining characters have been variously interpreted. Paruck (*ibid.* pp. 270, 390), in the most recent treatment of the subject, proposed to render the legend as *Airān afzūtānētī* "May he cause Īrān to prosper", though that involves introducing an irregular form of the verb. The same legend occurs on the only three known gold pieces (one in each of the national collections at London, Paris, and Berlin) each dated in the year 21, and each having on the reverse a similar figure with conical head-dress or nimbus, although the latter differs in style from the one on the silver coins in being more ornate, resembling a laurel wreath. If the figure is nimbate, then the coin, in addition, provides us with important historical evidence in the evolution of this *motif* in oriental art.

⁵ See article "Multān" in *Encyclopedia of Islām*.

ARAB GOVERNORS IN PERSIA.

(a) Coin weight of the Umayyad Viceroy Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf (d. A. H. 95 = A.D. 714).

3. Æ .95; wt. 388 grs. (25.14 grms.). [Pl. XVIII. 4.]

This is a unique coin weight in bronze which was issued by the authority of the celebrated Umayyad Governor in the "Two 'Irāks".

<i>Obv.</i>	<i>Rev.</i>
بسم الله امر	
الامير الحجاج	. . .
بن يوسف بالو	بسم الله
فاء هذا ميزن	عدل
ستة	. . .

Obv. (In Allah's name the Amīr al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf ordained Honesty. This is the measure^{5a} of six [mithkāl]).

Rev. [Six dots indicating the measure] (in Allah's name, Equity).

Taking the weight of a mithkāl (or dīnār) at 65.6 grs. (4.25 grms.) six would equal 393.6 grs. (25.5 grms.). As the present coin weight weighs 388 grs. (25.14 grms.), the loss of 5.6 (0.36 grm.) is very small considering that the metal is partly corroded.

Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf was one of the most dominant figures in the annals of early Islam, and his long years of loyalty and rigorous adherence to the cause of his

^{5a} Note the old *scriptio defectiva* of ميزان.

overlord 'Abd al Malik ibn Marwān, the fifth Umayyad Caliph, mark him out with singular distinction from the usual run of oriental governors. In the celebrated reform of the coinage instituted by the Caliph (c. A.H. 75-7) no small part seems to have been played by Ḥajjāj. His experimental dirhams are well known, and most Arabic historians associate his name with the monetary system of the period. He had one rival, apparently, according to tradition, in the person of a Jew named Sumair, who without authorization had produced silver coins of finer quality than the official ones of Ḥajjāj. The culprit was forthwith seized and was on the point of being executed, but he exclaimed "The standard (*iyār*) of my dirhams is more liberal than that of yours, so why do you kill me?" He then proposed weights (سنج الأوزان) for people to be able to detect deficient coins, but the idea, though accepted, did not save him from death. That is a paraphrase of the rather bare account given by Ibn al-Aṭhīr (iv, p. 337). The custom previously was to weigh one coin (of recognized good quality) against another. When a large number, say a thousand, had thus been weighed this lot was weighed against another thousand and the surplus carried forward. This is the substance of a fuller version of an Arabic writer quoted by Sauvaire in his *Matériaux pour servir à l'histoire de la numismatique et de la métrologie musulmanes*, p. 19, where after recording the above facts the author adds the surprising statement that the above system of weighing coins lasted until the time of Ḥajjāj *who was the first person for whom (coin) weights were made.*

The present coin weight, therefore, fits very well into the above setting. Issued by command of Ḥajjāj

and engraved with his name, it ante-dates (for Ḥajjāj died in A.H. 95) the earliest dated glass weight, as yet known to us, of the year A.H. 96.⁶

Although our bronze weight is not actually dated, it was probably issued as a standard weight about A.H. 75 during the Caliphate of 'Abd al-Malik (65-86), when the reform in the coinage was taking place.

Damīrī⁷ preserves for us the interesting detail that this Caliph was advised that he should "cast weights of glass which do not change either by increase or decrease".⁸ Such glass weights from Umayyad times onwards—particularly under the Fatimids in Egypt—are well known (see, e.g., Lane-Poole's *Cat. of Arabic Glass Weights*, 1891; Casanova, *op. cit.*). But the metal⁹ coin weights that were first employed by Muslims must be extremely rare. I know of no other published example. Hence the importance of this specimen.

⁶ E. T. Rogers in *J. R. A. S.*, N.S., x, p. 107. See also P. Casanova, *Catalogue des pièces de verre de la Collection Fouquet*, p. 367.

⁷ *Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān*, i, 80. Jayakar in his well-known translation wrongly renders the Arabic of this passage (i, 128): "You ought also to have scales made of glass which will not turn either way." The word which he translates as scales is *sanajāt* (سَنَاجَات) which also means *weights*. The *Encyclopedia of Islām* omits the article on *sanajāt* although there is a cross-reference to such under *dīnār*. No doubt the omission will be rectified in the Supplement. A note on the Arabic word for such a coin weight may not be out of place here. The technical term is *sanja* (both سَنَجَة and مَنَجَة have rival claims to recognition. See Lane *s.v.* where the former is considered a more chaste form.) There are two plural forms سَنَاجَات and مَنَاجِج.







⁸ Arabic Text, i, p. 59. وَتَصَبَّ مَنَاجِجٌ مِنْ قَوَارِيرَ لَا تَسْتَحِيلُ إِلَى زِيَادَةٍ وَلَا نَقْصَانٍ.

⁹ The writer quoted by Sauvaire, *ibid.*, p. 19 mentions weights made of iron.

(b) *The Umayyad Governor 'Ubaidallah ibn Ziyād*

(† A.H. 67 = A.D. 686)

(i) A unique type of *dirham*.4. $\text{Al } 1$; 41.3 grs. (2.68 grms.). [Pl. XVIII. 5.]



Obv. Bust of governor, head facing r., bearded, wearing winged head-dress; earring , breast ornament ; legend, downwards, r., below  in thick script  AUBITALA with s in front of chin,  I ZIYATAN l. downwards, after  AFZUT written defectively and GDH; all within triple circle, outer one of dots. (The coin is pierced at the top.)


Rev. Fire altar with small six-pointed star on either side of pedestal; r. a figure seated, facing the flames, and holding a torch in both hands; l. another celebrant standing in the same attitude; traces of outer circle; ornamented scroll r. and l. at bottom.

This is an entirely new rendering of the Arab-Sassanian type of *dirham*. The workmanship, particularly on the reverse, is more elaborately delineated than on any other example in the series. The attitudes of the two celebrants at the altar are quite different from the usual conventional facing figures that one is familiar with in this class of coin. In particular their wearing apparel is very carefully engraved, and the structure and ornamentation of the altar are strikingly detailed. Altogether it is a most remarkable coin to have been issued under an Arab governor. Unfortunately it bears neither mint nor date, but as the breast ornament of four annulets occurs on the *dirhams* of 'Ubaidallah struck at Darābjird in A.H. 51, it may be conjectured that this unique coin is a product of the same mint and period.

(ii) A unique *fals*.

5. Æ 1.1; wt. 46.8 grs. (3.03 grms.). [Pl. XVIII. 6.]







Obv. Usual bust facing r. with winged head-dress; ear-ring ; breast ornament ; legend r. downwards, as above, only in ordinary script; l. downwards, AFZUT GDH; all within double circle broken at top by the wings; star and crescent in each quarter of margin; in the second quarter AFD. (The edge of the coin is uneven.)

Rev. Conventional fire altar and two attendants, facing; legend r. downwards, mint  ST = Istakhr; l. downwards, date, almost illegible, probably NUNJA = 59; all within triple circle; star and crescent in each quarter of margin.

Bronze coins of the Arab governors in Persia are extremely rare, and this is the only known specimen bearing the name of 'Ubaidallah ibn Ziyād. Mr. P. Thorburn has in his collection a very badly worn specimen resembling the above, on which the name of the governor appears to be 'Abdallah, but the legend is too much effaced to be interpreted with any certainty.

(c) *Mukātil ibn Misma': a New Governor.*

6. A 1.3; wt. 59.8 grs. (3.87 grms.). [Pl. XVIII. 7.]

Obv. Usual bust facing r. with winged head-dress; ear-ring ; breast ornament ; legend r. downwards  MUKATL  I MSMAAN legend l. downwards AFZUT GDH; all within double circle; star and crescent in each quarter of margin; in second quarter  بسم الله; in third  نظرته (?). (The coin is pierced in four places.)

Rev. Usual fire altar and attendants; r. downwards, mint BISH (i.e. Bishāpūr); l. downwards, date YAḤFTAT i.e. 71; all within triple circle with star and crescent in each quarter of margin.

This is the first recorded coin of this governor. Tabarī (ii. 822, ed. De Goeje) mentions the interesting


fact that in the year 72, two sons of Misma' were appointed as provincial governors in Īrān by Khālīd ibn 'Abdallāh the Umayyad Governor of Baṣra. (1) 'Āmir over Sābūr (i.e. Bishāpūr) and (2) Misma' over Ardashīr Khurra; while a grandson, Misma' ibn Mālik ibn Misma' was sent to govern Fasā and Darābjird. It was after this that Muḳātil was placed in charge of the army to act in conjunction with 'Abd al 'Azīz, Khālīd's brother, on an expedition against the Azāriḳa, or religious sectarians, who were troubling the Iranian provinces. Katārī, the Khārijite claimant to the Caliphate, dispatched a body of 900 horsemen under Ṣāliḥ ibn Muḳhārīk to meet the attack. The Umayyad forces were routed and among the slain was Muḳātil ibn Misma' (Ibn al-Athīr, iv. 279, ed. Tornberg). All this is recorded of the year 72. The value of this new coin therefore lies in this, that it reveals the fact that in the previous year (71) Muḳātil had been in charge of Bishāpūr before he had been transferred to Ardashīr-Khurra, and succeeded by his brother 'Āmir. Unless, of course, Ṭabarī has confused the two brothers and their governorships. At all events the coin is contemporary evidence, and more likely to be true than the approximate statement of an historian many years after the event.


The unusual word on the obverse margin may be بدرية or بكرة or بدر but its interpretation at present eludes me.

ARAB GOVERNORS IN ṬABARISTĀN.

7. Ar .95; wt. 26.4 grs. (1.71 grms.). [Pl. XVIII. 8.]

Obv. Usual type of bust facing r. and wearing winged head-dress; breastornament. ♡. legend r. downwards

in Kufic script حَرَشِي i.e. حَرَشِي (ḤARASHĪ), l. downwards AFZUT GDH; all within double circle broken at top by wings of head-dress; star and crescent in each quarter of margin with traces of the word AFD in the second quarter and  in the third.

Rev. Usual fire altar and attendants; legend r. downwards, mint  TPURSTAN (Ṭabaristān); l. downwards, date uncertain, probably 131: all within triple circle; margin, star, and crescent in each quarter with triangle of dots between each.

Several important government officials under the 'Abbāsid Caliphs bore the name of al-Ḥarashī.¹⁰ The above specimen is the only example of his coinage so far in the British Museum, and is the only example known to me of this series where the name Ḥarashī occurs. Mordtmann¹¹ records two coins dated 129 and 130 respectively which he ascribes to Yaḥyā al-Ḥarashī (although he puts الحَرَشِي for الحَرَشِي). But these coins only bear the name of Yaḥyā (يَحْيَى). One of them was published, and fortunately illustrated, by Tornberg in 1856¹² and ascribed by him to another governor of Ṭabaristān named Yaḥyā ibn Mikhnāḳ¹³ whose date fits in with the numismatic evidence. Zambaur in his list of Arab governors in Ṭabaristān¹⁴ apparently ascribes the Yaḥyā coins to Abū Ṣāliḥ Yaḥyā ibn Dā'ūd ibn Mamdūd al-Ḥarashī who was in office there in A.H. 166-7. If the date on our Ḥarashī coin is 131

¹⁰ See, e.g., Zambaur, *Contributions*, ii, pp. 4-6.

¹¹ *Z. D. M. G.*, 1865, p. 495; 1879, p. 110.

¹² *Symbolae ad rem numariam Muhammedanorum*, iii, pp. 26-27, pl. I, no. 4.

¹³ So Ibn Isfandiyār (trans. by Browne) but Zahīr al-Dīn: *Ta'rikh-i-Ṭabaristān* (ed. Dorn, p. 275) gives ibn Mikhnāf.

¹⁴ *Manuel de généalogie*, p. 187. See also his *Contributions*, i, p. 27.

then it would appear that Yahyā and Ḥarashī are the same person, since 131 in terms of the Ṭabaristān Era (T.E.) = A.D. 782 = A.H. 166. In the list of governors, however, handed down by Ibn Isfandiyār and Zahr al-Dīn the only one bearing the name of Ḥarashī is ‘Abdallāh ibn Sa‘īd al-Ḥarashī who was in control sometime after the governors Sulaimān, Hānī, and ‘Abdallāh, and since the dates on the extant coins of these last three range from T.E. 136–40 one would conclude that Ḥarashī’s coin would be posterior to 140. Now we do actually possess coins of the anonymous type (i.e. with AFZUT in place of the governor’s name) which are dated 142 and 143 (the latest date recorded). But as these differ in style by having an additional circle both on obverse and reverse, one might argue for a date T.E. 141 (= A.D. 792 = A.H. 176). But Dr. Unvala, who is at present engaged on a special study of the epigraphy of these coins, to whom I communicated the above specimen, assures me that the date is very peculiarly written but that in all probability it is intended to be 131. Perhaps the future, however, will provide us with a better preserved specimen which will settle the question of attribution and date.

J. WALKER.

XIX.

THE SOUTH FERRIBY THEODOSIAN HOARD.

[SEE PLATES XIX-XX.]

THE foreshore at South Ferriby in North Lincolnshire close to the mouth of the river Humber has been a most prolific site for the collectors of antiquities. A hoard of gold and silver British coins was found in 1906 and described by Mr. Bernard Roth¹ and Mr. Thomas Sheppard, Director of the Hull Museums, has on different occasions published some of the many small metal objects of Roman date found there.²

The latter in the first of his articles describes the site in the following words: "Between the Hall and the chalk pit at South Ferriby there is a small piece of cliff, about a mile in length, which is alternately assailed or neglected by the waters of the Humber, according to the trend of the currents in the estuary. It will occasionally happen that for years the tide never reaches the cliff foot: consequently the clay slips, vegetation flourishes, and collecting is not a success. Then without any apparent reason, the waters will suddenly begin to wash all the loose material away and expose a good clean section. Of the nature of this, which varies from 2 or 3 to 12 or 15 feet in height, detailed particulars have been given elsewhere." ("Notes on the Geology of South Ferriby,

¹ *Brit. Num. Journ.*, 1906, 1-16 and *Num. Chron.*, 1908, 17-55.

² *Hull Museum Publications*, Nos. 38 and 39 (= *Trans. Hull Scientific and F. Nat. Club*, III, iv, 247), 64 and 65 (= *ibid.*, IV, ii, 55).

Lines." : *Trans. of the Lincolnshire Naturalists' Union for 1905*, pp. 53-72). Mr. Sheppard has told the present writer that most of the finds are made on the shore adjacent to the field known as Caddels Field. It is suggested, moreover, that this name is a corruption of Chad's Well, since the well, which still exists in this field, appears to have been a holy well, and pins have been dropped into it within living memory.

Mr. Thomas Smith, better known locally as "Coin Tommy", made a speciality of collecting Roman coins from this stretch of the foreshore, and at his death his collections were secured for the Hull Museum. Some of these coins have been described by Mr. T. Pickersgill in *Hull Museum Publication*, No. 80³ and Mr. J. W. E. Pearce has recently published an account of them in the *Numismatic Circular*, 1935, xliii, cols. 214-219.

"Coin Tommy's" successor was the late Mr. Thomas Hatliffe, and one of his discoveries was the hoard which forms the subject of the present paper. The vessel was found on its side and embedded in the mud; inside the pot was a silver ring and six silver coins, a *miliarensis* of Valens and *siliquae* of Constantius II, Julian (2), Valentinian I, and Gratian. Mr. Sheppard published this find in *Hull Museum Publication*, No. 70 with a plate of all the objects and a comparison of the ring with some of the parallels. On this evidence, with the addition of a note of two other *siliquae* (one of Arcadius) found at South Ferriby, which occurs in Mr. Pickersgill's list (*loc. cit.*, p. 155), the present writer included this find in his biblio-

³ *Hull Scientific and F. Nat. Club*, IV, iii, 147 (1911).

graphy of Theodosian hoards.⁴ After the appearance of the bibliography Mr. Sheppard mentioned that a large number of similar coins had come from the same site since the pot was discovered, and he has now most kindly placed them at the writer's disposal for publication.⁵ They were all found soon after the pot was discovered and in its immediate vicinity. There cannot be any reasonable doubt that they were originally inside it and formed one hoard.

THE POTTERY VESSEL. (FIG. 1.)

Owing to the circumstances of the finding of the hoard the containing vessel remains in good preservation.⁶ In two places the surface has flaked off, a small piece is missing from the rim, and there are two cracks down the side, as can be seen in the photograph reproduced in *Hull Museum Publication, No. 70*.

It is of typical Romano-British dark grey ware with slightly burnished surface and, although wheel-made, stands somewhat unevenly on account of inequalities in the finish of the foot-ring.⁷ There is a distinct shoulder below the neck and a "kick-up" at the base. The only decoration is a pair of parallel shallow girth grooves. It shows evident traces of its Belgic antecedents and the closest parallel which can be found for its shape is Richborough No. 249,⁸ which is of Flavian date. The South Ferriby vessel has a recurved, in-

⁴ *Arch. Journ.*, xc, 298 ff.

⁵ The writer is indebted to Mr. Sheppard for much help and information and for allowing him to republish the earlier discovery.

⁶ The usual fate was for the vessel to be broken and the pieces lost, see Bibliography in *Arch. Journ.*, xc, 298 ff.

⁷ On the section an average depth of foot-ring is given.

⁸ *Rep. Res. Ctee. Soc. Ant.*, x, p. 172. Pl. XXXV.

stead of oblique rim, but can hardly have been made at a later time than the late first or early second century A.D.⁹ Presumably, therefore, it remained in use for about three centuries—it is a convenient shape




FIG. 1. The Pottery Vessel ($\frac{1}{2}$).

and is a sturdy, well-baked vessel—and is of greater interest for this reason.

THE RING (FIG. 2).

The ring is a silver signet ring for the use of a man. It weighs 4.927 grammes and measures internally 2 cm. from side to side and 1.9 cm. from top to bottom. The hoop is plain, c. 1 mm. in thickness, 3.5 mm. wide at the bottom and widening to 5.5 mm. at the shoulders. The internal surface is flat, the hammer-marks being plainly visible, and the external convex. At the bottom a repair has been effected in base metal in ancient




FIG. 2. The South Ferriby Ring ($\frac{1}{2}$).

⁹ The writer is indebted to Dr. R. E. Mortimer Wheeler for confirmation of this dating.

times. The bezel consists of a solid rectangular piece of silver, 8 mm. by 7 mm. and 2 mm. thick, with slightly undercut sides. It has a flat top which bears a very crude engraved device within a border of engraved or punched dots. The design appears to represent on the left a bird turned right and on the right a tree. The bird is shown with two flippers and its head is rendered in a similar manner. If the poise of such a crude figure is significant the bird might be a cormorant or penguin; the "tree" is probably intended to be a branch. The identification of the group as a dove and sprig of olive, presumably a Christian *motif*, is possible, but makes an even greater call upon the imagination.

A very similar silver ring was found at Whorlton in the North Riding of Yorkshire in 1810 with silver ingots, broken spoons, and other ornaments, and 150 silver coins ranging down to Honorius.¹⁰ Of these 40 are in the British Museum (with some of the ornaments) and all are very badly clipped *siliquae*. The ring, which is among




FIG. 3. The Whorlton Ring ($\frac{1}{2}$).

the ornaments in the British Museum, does not appear to have been published before; it is shown here by permission of the Keeper of the Department of British and Medieval Antiquities. The bezel is of the same type as in the South Ferriby example and the device, in this case, apparently, a bird standing left, is rendered in the same crude fashion.

Another ring of this class was found at the Droitwich Roman *villa* by Mr. H. R. Hodgkinson, F.S.A. and was

¹⁰ Elgee, *The Romans in Cleveland*, 8.

presented by him to the British Museum in 1928.¹¹ It has not, however, been figured hitherto and is now shown (Fig. 4) with the excavator's permission and again by the kindness of the Keeper of the Depart-




FIG. 4. Silver ring and gold mounted bone pin from Bays Meadow, Droitwich ($\frac{1}{2}$).

ment concerned. On this ring the engraved device is a duck walking right. With the ring is shown the gold mounted bone pin, which was found during the same excavation.

Two similar silver rings were found at the Roman *villa* site at Fifehead Neville, Dorset, about 1882.¹² Both have the Christian monogram engraved on the bezel and one has also the figure of a bird (?dove) flanked on each side by a branch.

Finally there are three rings in the British Museum, found at Amesbury, Wiltshire, once again with a

¹¹ *Trans. Birmingham Arch. Soc.*, li, 37.

¹² Figured in *Proc. Soc. Ant.*, 2nd Series, ix, 68. The writer is indebted for this reference to Lt.-Col. C. D. Drew, F.S.A.

Theodosian hoard of coins.¹³ In this case the coins were said to range down to Theodosius II, but, if the hoard could now be located, doubtless this ascription would be found to be inaccurate.¹⁴ The Amesbury rings are figured in the above-mentioned account and in the *B.M. Catalogue of Rings* (Nos. 1205-7). The loops and bezels are in the same style as the rings already discussed and the engravings are of the same nature, but they show much better workmanship, although still clearly of provincial origin. One has four helmeted heads face to face and between them an unusual object, perhaps a thunderbolt. The second has a figure of a stag couchant regardant and above it a bird, whilst flanking the bezel are triangular-shaped ornaments composed of pellets and incised lines with dots. The third ring shows a winged quadruped and plain parallel ornament beside the bezel.

THE COINS.

The coins number 228 and, although there would have been room in the pot for more, since about half of them are clipped, there is no real reason to suppose that the hoard was originally much larger. As the pot was found on its side certainty on this point is impossible, but the constant watch, which was kept on the shore, does not suggest that much of value was overlooked.

There are four *miliarensia* and of these the piece of Honorius (No. 4, Pl. XIX. 2) would undoubtedly stamp

¹³ *Proc. Soc. Ant.*, 2nd Series, iv, 27.

¹⁴ A similar dating in the case of the Terling Treasure proved to be wrong (*Num. Chron.*, 1933, 145 ff., and *Arch. Journ.*, 1846, 162).

the hoard as remarkable even without its other interesting features, which are discussed below. The reverse legend of this coin (**VIRTVS EXERCITVM**) is apparently unique, not only for Honorius, but even for the whole period, the normal being in the singular—**VIRTVS EXERCITVS**. Moreover the design, for the silver coinage of the late fourth century, is very finely executed and even excels the work on much of the gold coinage of this date.

Coin No. 163 (**PL. XX. 18**, Arcadius), appears to be a "half-*siliqua*". It is only slightly clipped all round, almost all the legend being legible, but weighs only 8.9 grains. The type is small and closely resembles the common 4 *Æ* coins of Arcadius, etc.

The coins are as follows:—

[NOTE.—All have the normal obverse type, viz. bust diademed (double row of pearls), draped and cuirassed right, unless otherwise stated. The weight, in grains, of each coin is given at the end of each reverse type. The weights follow precisely the order of the mint-marks, a comma being placed between every coin, a semi-colon at the conclusion of a mint-mark. cl. after a weight, sometimes with qualifying adverb = clipped.]

MILIARENSIA.

Valens.

1-3. *Obv.* D N VALEN | S P F AVG

Rev. VIRTVS | EXERCITVS Emperor standing r. looking l. and holding standard and shield.

Mint. TRPS• (Trier). (69.4 [**PL. XIX. 1**], 67.2, 64.7.)

Honorius.

4. *Obv.* D N HONORI | VS P F AVG

Rev. VIRTVS | EXERCITVM Emperor standing half r. looking l. and holding sceptre and shield.

Mint. MDPŠ (Milan). (61.0 [Pl. XIX. 2].)

SILIVAE.

Constantius II.

Obv. (in all cases) D N CONSTAN | TIVS P F AVG

5-8. *Rev.* VICTORIA | DD NN AVG Victory l. with wreath and palm.

Mint. LVG (4) (Lyons). (32.6 [Pl. XIX. 3], 25.5, 15.0 cl., 14.7 cl.)

9-10. *Rev.* VOTIS XXX • MVLTIS XXXX in wreath.

Mint. PCON (2) (Arles). (30.4, 28.7.)

11-18. *Rev.* VOTIS XXX MVLTIS XXXX in wreath.

Mint. PCON (2), SCON, CON (Arles); LVG (Lyons); + 3 cut off. (30.7, 30.0; 27.9 [Pl. XIX. 5]; 30.4; 33.6 [Pl. XIX. 4]; 19.1 cl., 19.0 cl., 11.0 cl.)

Julian.

19-21. *Obv.* FL CL IVLIA | NVS P P AVG

Rev. VICTORIA | DD NN AVG Victory l. with wreath and palm.

Mint. LVG (2) (Lyons); + 1 cut off. (29.5, 26.1; 17.5 cl.)

Rev. VOTIS V MVLTIS X in wreath.

22-4. *Obv.* [D N IVLIANV | S] NOS CAES Bust bare, draped and cuirassed r.

Mint. CON (Arles) + 2 cut off (19.6 cl.; 16.1 cl., 13.7 cl.)

25-9. *Obv.* FL CL IVLIA | NVS P P AVG Rosette
diadem.

Mint. SLVG (2). LVG (3) (Lyons) (32.4, 30.7; 34.8,
31.9, 29.1 [Pl. XIX. 7].)

30-4. *Obv.* D N IVLIAN | VS P F AVG.

Mint. TCON (3) (Arles) + 2 cut off. (31.3, 30.9,
29.1 [Pl. XIX. 6]; 17.0 cl., 15.5 cl.)

35-6. *Obv.* and *Mint.* illegible 2. (16.3 cl., 15.5 cl.)

Rev. VOT X MVLT XX in wreath

37. *Obv.* FL CL IVLIA | NVS P P AVG Rosette
diadem.

Mint. CONST (Arles) (27.8 [Pl. XIX. 8].)

38-47. *Obv.* D N FL CL IVLI | ANVS P F AVG
Bearded head.

Mint. PCONST, SCONST (2), TCONST (3),
CONST (4) (Arles) (32.7; 29.1, 27.8
[Pl. XIX. 9]; 29.1, 28.0, 25.5; 32.0, 28.2,
18.8 cl., 13.7 cl.).

Constantius II or Julian.

48-9. *Obv.* illegible.

Rev. [VICTORIA | DD NN AVG] Victory l.
with wreath and palm.

Mint. illeg. (2) but probably LVG (Lyons) (13.6 cl.,
12.9 cl.)

[The reverse types VRBS ROMA and VIRTUS
ROMANORVM are numbered as follows:—

I. Rome seated on throne or chair, holding Victory
on globe and sceptre (less commonly spear). *Virtus*
type has spear instead of sceptre and no Victory.

II. Rome seated on cuirass, holding Victory on globe
and reversed spear, rarely a sceptre.]

Valentinian I.

Obv. (in all cases) D N VALENTINI | ANVS P
F AVG

50. *Rev.* RESTITV | TOR REIP Emp. stg. front,
looking r., holding labarum and victory on
globe.

Mint. SLVG (Lyons). (30.6 [Pl. XIX. 10].)


51-5. *Rev.* VRBS | ROMA Type I.

Mint. RP (2) (Rome); TRPS• (3) (Trier). (31.8,
27.1 [Pl. XIX. 13]; 34.4 [Pl. XIX. 12],
28.7 [Pl. XIX. 11], 26.0.)

Valens.

Obv. (Except No. 62) D N VALEN | S P F AVG

56-9. *Rev.* RESTITV | TOR REIP As No. 50.

Mint. OF | I | *
| •,  (Arles, both with shaft of
[CON]
labarum plain); PLVG (X on labarum),
SLVG• (hook on labarum) (Lyons). (20.8
cl.; 16.4 cl.; 22.1 cl.; 34.7 [Pl. XIX. 15].)

60-1. *Rev.* VOT V MV•LT X in wreath.

Mint. RB (2) (Rome). (30.6, 27.2 slightly cl.)

62. *Obv.* D N VALENS | P F AVG

Rev. VOT XX MVLTT XXX in wreath.

Mint. CONCM (Constantinople). (25.5 [Pl.
XIX. 14].)

63-76. *Rev.* VRBS | ROMA Type I.

Mint. TRPS• (8) (Trier) + 6 cut off. (36.1, 33.1
[Pl. XIX. 17], 31.8, 30.9, 28.0, 27.2, 27.1,
26.6; 20.7 cl., 17.5 cl. [Pl. XIX. 16], 16.2 cl.,
13.9 cl., 13.3 cl., 11.1 cl.)

77-9. *Rev.* VRBS | ROMA Type II.

Mint. TRPS (2), TRPS• (Trier). (33.0, 24.5 slightly cl.; 33.0.)

Valentinian I or Valens.

Obv. Illegible.

80-6. *Rev.* [RESTITV | TOR REIP] As no. 50.

Mint. Illegible (cut off) (7). (20.8 cl., 17.8 cl., 16.2 cl., 15.0 cl., 15.0 cl., 14.2 cl., 11.6 cl.)

87. *Rev.* VOT V MV•LT X in wreath.

Mint. Illegible (cut off) but Rome. (15.4 cl.)

Gratian.

Obv. (In all cases) D N GRATIA | NVS P F
AVG

88-93. *Rev.* VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type I.

Mint. TRPS (6) (Trier). (29.2, 27.9 [Pl. XIX. 19], 21.1 cl., 16.5 cl., 15.3 cl. [Pl. XIX. 18], 14.7 cl.)

94-107. *Rev.* VRBS | ROMA Type I.

Mint. R * ~~////~~ + 1 [R * T attributed by die identity] (Rome); TRPS• (12) (Trier) including 7 attributed by die identities. (14.7 cl.; 11.9 cl.; 33.3, 33.1 [Pl. XIX. 20], 28.4, 25.0 slightly cl., 22.6 slightly cl., 21.0 cl. [Pl. XX. 1], 19.1 cl., 16.3 cl., 16.1 cl., 13.7 cl., 13.6 cl., 13.4 cl.)

108-18. *Rev.* VRBS | ROMA Type II.

Mint. X *
[AQPS•] (2—same dies) (Aquileia); TRPS (2)
incl. 1 attributed by die identity, TRPS•
(5—incl 3 attributed by die identities),
TRPS ~~////~~ (2) (Trier). (12.8 cl., 12.0 cl.; 33.0 [Pl. XX. 2], 12.1 cl.; 30.5, 28.6, 17.0 cl., 14.2 cl., 12.6 cl.; 37.0, 17.2 cl.)

Magnus Maximus.

119-22. *Obv.* D N MAG MA | XIMVS P F AVG*Rev.* VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type I Spear wholly seen.*Mint.* $\overline{\text{AQPS}}$ (Aquileia); $\overline{\text{MDPS}}$ (2—including 1 attributed by die identity) (Milan) + 1 ? $\overline{\text{AQPS}}$ or $\overline{\text{MDPS}}$. (16.3 slightly cl. [Pl. XX. 3]; 24.6 [Pl. XX. 4], 12.0 cl. [Pl. XX. 5]; 15.7 cl.)*Obv.* D N MAG MAX | IMVS P F AVG123-32. *Rev.* VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type I.*Mint.* $\overline{\text{TRPS}}$ (10—including 5 attributed by die identities) (Trier). (31.0 [Pl. XX. 6], 26.6, 24.9, 15.7 cl., 15.3 cl. [Pl. XX. 7], 15.0 cl., 14.5 cl., 11.7 cl., 10.6 cl., 10.6 cl.)133. *Rev.* As foregoing but sceptre instead of reversed spear.*Mint.* $\overline{\text{TRPS}}$ (Trier). (18.0.)

Flavius Victor.

134-5. *Obv.* D N FL VIC | TOR P F AVG*Rev.* VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type I.*Mint.* $\overline{\text{TRPS}}$ (Trier); $\overline{\text{MDPS}}$ (Milan)—spear wholly seen. (16.0 slightly cl. [Pl. XX. 8]; 10.3 cl.)

Valentinian II.

136-7. *Obv.* D N VALENTINIANVS IVN P F AVG*Rev.* VICTOR | IA AVGGG Victory l. with wreath and palm.*Mint.* $\overline{\text{TRPS}}$ (2) (Trier). (17.5 cl., 13.6 cl.)138. *Obv.* D N VALENTINI | ANVS P F AVG*Rev.* VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type I.*Mint.* $\overline{\text{AQPS}}$ (Aquileia); (27.5 [Pl. XX. 9].)

139-40. *Obv.* As foregoing.

Rev. VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type II.

Mint. [TRPS] (2—attributed by die identities)
(Trier). (17.0 cl., 14.8 cl.)

141. *Obv.* As foregoing.

Rev. VRBS | ROMA Type II.

Mint. LVGPS (Lyons). (17.3 cl.)

142. *Obv.* D N VALENTINIANVS P F AVG

Rev. VOT V MVLT X in wreath.

Mint. SISCPS (Siscia). (23.0 [Pl. XX. 10].)

143. *Obv.* As No. 138.

Rev. VOT X MVLT XX in wreath.

Mint. MDPS (Milan). (20.8 not cl. [Pl. XX. 11].)

Theodosius I.

Obv. (In all cases) D N THEODO | SIVS P F
AVG

144. *Rev.* CONCOR | DIA AVGGG Constantinople
seated facing, head r. with sceptre and
cornucopiae; foot on prow.

Mint. [TRPS] (Trier). (16.5 cl.)

145-7. *Rev.* VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type I.

Mint. AQPS (Aquilaia); TRPS (2) (Trier). (25.9
[Pl. XX. 12]; 33.5 [Pl. XX. 13], 16.1 cl.)

148-57. *Rev.* VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type II.

Mint. MDPS (Milan); TRPS (9—including 4 attri-
buted by die identities) (Trier). (9.5 cl.;
29.7 [Pl. XX. 15], 24.2, 14.7 cl., 14.5 cl.
[Pl. XX. 14], 14.5 cl., 12.4 cl., 12.1 cl.,
11.2 cl., 9.7 cl.)

158. *Rev.* VRBS | ROMA Type II.

Mint. LVGPS (Lyons). (13.0 cl. [Pl. XX. 16].)

Eugenius.

159-62. *Obv.* [D N EVGENI] | VS P F AVG

Rev. VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type II.

Mint. [TRPS] (4) (Trier). (15.0 cl., 12.2 cl.
[Pl. XX. 17], 11.3 cl., 8.8 cl.)

Arcadius.

Obv. (In all cases) D N ARCADI | VS P F AVG

163. *Rev.* VICTORI | A AVGGG Victory running
l. with wreath and palm.

Mint. Illegible but ? AQPS, MD or RM. [N.B.
? half-siliqua] (8.9 cl. [Pl. XX. 18].)

164-77. *Rev.* VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type II.

Mint. MDPS (7—attribution by die identities)(Milan);
TRPS (7—including 5 attributed by die
identities) (Trier). (All clipped except per-
haps one—17.0, 15.4, 15.2, 14.8, 11.3, 10.2,
9.8; 18.6 ? slightly cl. [Pl. XX. 22], 17.3,
15.3, 14.7, 13.9, 12.8 [Pl. XX. 23], 12.6.)

178-80. *Rev.* VOT V MVLT X in wreath.

Mint. MDPS (3) (Milan). (20.4, 20.0 [Pl. XX. 19],
19.3.)

181-2. *Rev.* VOT X MVLT XV in wreath.

Mint. [MDPS] (2) (Milan). (13.2 cl. [Pl. XX. 20],
11.3 cl.)

183. *Rev.* VRBS | ROMA Type II.

Mint. LVGPS (Lyons). (27.4 [Pl. XX. 21].)

Honorius.

Obv. (In all cases) D N HONORI | VS P F AVG

184-203. *Rev.* VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type II.

Mint. MDPS (20—including 8 attributed by die
identities) (Milan). (All clipped except

where stated—18.9, 17.2 not cl., 17.1, 16.9, 15.8 [Pl. XX. 26], 15.5, 15.0, 14.5, 14.5, 14.5, 14.3, 13.9, 13.7 not cl. [Pl. XX. 24], 13.0, 12.9, 12.2, 12.0, 10.9, 9.6, 9.0.)

204-9. *Rev.* VOT V MVL T X in wreath (one barbarous VT V . . .).

Mint. MDPS (6—legible in 3 cases) (Milan). (All clipped—17.5, 15.6, 13.3, 13.1 [Pl. XX. 25], 13.0, 12.9.)

Arcadius or Honorius.

210-28. *Obv.* Illegible, but most apparently Honorius.

Rev. VIRTVS RO | MANORVM Type II.

Mint. MDPS (19—legible in 3 cases, but remainder certainly correct) (Milan). (All clipped—16.0, 14.9, 13.8, 13.3, 13.1, 13.0, 12.7, 11.6, 11.3, 11.3, 11.2, 10.8, 10.6, 10.4, 10.2, 10.0, 10.0, 9.1, 8.5.)

THE CLIPPED COINS

Many of the coins are clipped; indeed in the case of about one-third of the total the obverse legends are clipped off and the emperor's names consequently not legible. It has, therefore, been a necessity as well of course as a great pleasure to enlist the services of Mr. J. W. E. Pearce,¹⁵ and he has most kindly examined the whole hoard and has with very few exceptions been able to assign the coins to emperors from the reverse types.

The actual process of the clipping can be seen on some of the coins. First a line or rather a series of

¹⁵ Mr. Pearce has also been so kind as to undertake the arduous work of weighing all the coins. Without this help publication would have been much delayed.

straight lines was drawn round the circumference of the coin, a succession of chords. (These are sometimes still visible, when the subsequent blow was inaccurate.) Then by the use of chisel and hammer segments have been cut off and the angular flans of these coins have resulted. Subsequent use has smoothed the edges and corners.

It is, of course, possible to find in this collection a complete series of weights from the heaviest unclipped coins through those of intermediate weight, i.e. the later light unclipped coins and a few heavier clipped coins, to the lightest of the clipped coins and the so-called "half-*siliqua*" of Arcadius (No. 163), which weighs 8.9 grains. Careful scrutiny, however, shows that, whereas the unclipped coins seldom weigh less than 20 grains and are commonly much heavier, the clipped varieties rarely exceed 20 grains in weight and are usually of 15 grains or less. Nevertheless they seldom weigh less than 10 grains and only two clipped coins are lighter than the "half-*siliqua*" of Arcadius.

There seems, therefore, in spite of a number of coins of intermediate weight to be a definite distinction between the ordinary *siliquae* and the clipped coins. It is true that the latter are by no means uniform in weight, but they do appear to be largely uniform in size, the differing weights being due to the varying thickness of the coins. This is shown in the clipped coins, which have been selected for illustration,¹⁶ and was very noticeable when handling the coins for identification.

¹⁶ The writer is indebted to Mr. H. Mattingly for assistance in the preparation of the plates.

All these characteristics, methodical clipping, so different from the rough pruning of bronze coins such as the specimen of Carausius from Bourton-on-the-Water,^{16a} use after clipping, and consistency in size, if not in weight, seem to suggest that the expedient was used officially for a particular purpose. It may have been caused by an imperial retariffing, represented by the rare 'half-*siliquae*',¹⁷ but little is known about these small coins. The one specimen in the present hoard (No. 163) weighs less than almost all the clipped coins; this is due to its exceptional thinness. In addition, it is smaller in size than most of the clipped coins. On the other hand the clipping may have been due to the scarcity of metal, just as the clipping and reduction in size of the later fourth-century bronze coins was due to the scarcity of copper. As Mr. Mattingly points out, the *miliarensis* is never found clipped, and it is presumed that the standard of this coin was maintained along with that of the *solidus*. The *siliqua*, however, may by this time have become merely currency. In this case an official clipping would be an easy way to save metal, the clipped coins being made to have the same purchasing value as the whole *siliqua*. Whether at the same time any unclipped coins were retariffed at double their original value must remain uncertain, (although it is unlikely), and the intermediate slightly clipped coins are admittedly a difficulty. Possibly the clipping was gradually increased during a term of years, as the coins reached the head-quarters of the government, being slight at first and gradually becoming

^{16a} v. *infra*, p. 280.

¹⁷ v. *Num. Chron.*, 1915, 468 ff., and Pearce, *The Roman Coinage from A.D. 364 to 423*, p. 104.

more drastic, but at no time was the emperor's image defaced.

Records of nearly seventy hoards (in all metals) of the Theodosian period are preserved.¹⁸ Clipped *siliquae* exist or are recorded in only five cases, viz.: Suffolk, Icklingham I; Wiltshire, Manton Downs; Yorkshire, Whorlton; Ireland, Coleraine; and the present hoard from Lincolnshire. The circumstances of the Wiltshire find suggest that it may have been loot and thus have travelled far; the Coleraine hoard had certainly been carried from Britain. Thus, apart from the Icklingham collection, clipped coins seem rather to be a north-country feature, especially if it may be suggested that the Coleraine hoard came from that district. Such an overland route is not impossible and is supported by the Fleetwood (Lancashire) find, which wears the appearance of raider's loot, buried on the eve of departure for Ireland. It is at least strange that no clipped coins seem to exist or to have been recorded from the many hoards of the period found in Somerset.

If it should indeed prove to be the case that these clipped coins are a product of the north, the obvious town from which they must have emanated is York, the capital of the northern division of the province and the seat of the Duke of the Britains. Little is known of the history of York at this period. The signal-stations of the coast were in use at least until A.D. 395, although they were perhaps destroyed quite soon afterwards, and under their protection civil life flourished in north-east Yorkshire at the same period.

¹⁸ *Arch. Journ.*, xc, 298 ff.—records of four more hoards (one lost) are to hand.

York, it may be expected, like other towns lasted some time longer, but little coin evidence is available in usable form and a recent excavation has indeed been interpreted as indicating that it "cannot have survived long after the close of the fourth century".¹⁹ The writer has, however, recently been enabled, by the kindness of Mr. Geoffrey Thompson, F.S.A., to examine some of the Roman coins in York Museum. There are two *siliquae* of Arcadius, one very worn and the other badly clipped, in this collection and they are certainly not coins, which would normally figure in a collector's cabinet.²⁰ It may, therefore, be stated with conviction that they were found in York or neighbourhood and they tend to support the suggestions put forward above, viz. the survival of York after A.D. 400 and the possibility that it was the centre from which the clipped *siliquae* were distributed.

THE DATE OF THE HOARD.

It is usual to assign as a date to a hoard the date of minting of the latest coin contained in it, since the amount of wear and other such factors cannot be accurately gauged in terms of years.

In a note on the Terling Treasure²¹ Mr. J. W. E. Pearce has discussed the dates of the latest Roman silver hoards found in this country. After A.D. 395 the only

¹⁹ P. Corder in *Yorks. Archit. and Arch. Soc.*, i, 17. See also on this subject, *Arch. Journ.*, xci, 350.

²⁰ Unfortunately in few cases is the provenance of the coins known. There are about a dozen 4 *Æ* coins of the period A.D. 388-95 in the collection, which are also not likely to be from a collector's cabinet and may, therefore, be looked upon as local finds.

²¹ *Num. Chron.*, 1933, 170 ff.

criterion for dating at present available is the number of coins from the mint of Milan of that period, which can be assigned respectively to Theodosius I, Arcadius, and Honorius, with the occasional help of coins of the time of Constantine III (A.D. 408-11). In this way the hoards from Coleraine,²² Sproxton (Leicestershire),²³ and Terling (Essex) have been dated to the first decade of the fifth century. The coins from Milan in these hoards are few in number for Theodosius, but common for Arcadius and Honorius. The coins of the latter outnumber those of his brother by 2 : 1 or even more.

In the South Ferriby hoard these features are again very strongly marked, especially if most of Nos. 210-28 are really coins of Honorius. Of the **VIRTVS ROMANORVM** type, minted at Milan, Honorius has 20 to 7 of Arcadius, whilst there is only one attributed to Theodosius. The hoard may therefore be dated at least as late as the three other collections already mentioned, i.e. c. A.D. 410.

B. H. ST. J. O'NEIL.

²² *Num. Chron.*, 1933, 170 ff.

²³ *Ibid.*, 1934, 61 ff.

XX.

SOME STRATIFIED COINS OF c. A.D. 390-400, FROM BOURTON-ON-THE-WATER.

EXCAVATIONS were undertaken in 1934 by Miss H. E. Donovan on the site of a Romano-British building situated at the Lansdown (i.e. west) end of Bourton-on-the-Water, Gloucestershire. Over eighty coins were found in the small space available for excavation, and a list of these has been published in the full report in the *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, vol. 56, pp. 99 ff.

The discovery of a bronze coin of Valentinian I (A.D. 364-75) embedded in a yellow gravel floor shows that this building, presumably a *villa*, was still in use, indeed was repaired or rebuilt, at this period. Such a circumstance, which probably indicates recovery after the wide destruction of the Pictish invasion of A.D. 367, has rarely been noted before, the *villa* at Langton in NE. Yorkshire¹ being the only certain example so far recorded.

At the new Bourton site above this gravel floor there is a stone floor, over 1 ft. thick, built in two layers, the lower of horizontal, the upper of slanting slabs of oolite. In the northern portion of this part of the site the slanting stones do not occur, but there can be no doubt that the floor is all of one build and one period.

Eleven bronze coins were found on the surface of

¹ Roman Malton and District, Report no. 4 (1932).

this stone floor or actually in the crevices between the stones in such positions that there can be no doubt that they were dropped either during the construction or during the use of this floor. Four of the coins, including that of Claudius II, were found in the writer's presence, and he is satisfied that they could not have slipped down from the topsoil above.² From the stratification this stone floor is seen to be of late fourth-century date, and its actual period, viz. the last decade of the century or later, is fixed by the two coins of A.D. 388-95, which are amongst the eleven.³

The whole of this small collection must, therefore, be contemporary, and in the prevailing absence of stratified deposits of this period, forms a most interesting illustration of the common coinage, which was then in use. The coins are as follows:—

Claudius II posthumous (Altar)—obverse only slightly worn, reverse more worn—clipped all round to a diameter of 1.3 cm.

Carausius (new variety and double-struck *v. inf.*)—in mint condition but clipped all round to a diameter of 1.85 cm.

Barbarous Radiates—(1) Little worn, clipped irregularly to 4 \AA size, 1.3 cm. \times 1.1 cm.; (2) Small flan (6.5 mm. diameter) not clipped, but resembling those of Theodosian 4 \AA . The design is correspondingly small and is quite well executed; reverse ? *Spes* type.

Constantine I. Two Victories type ($\overline{\text{PLN}}$)—3 \AA full size—slightly worn.

Constantine I. *Urbs Roma* ($\overline{\text{TRP}}$). Slightly worn. 4 \AA size. Probably not clipped, but an inadequate flan as is common with this series.

Constantius II. *Fel. Temp. R* ($\overline{\text{PLG}}$ blundered). Slightly worn. 4 \AA size, as foregoing.

² In any case the topsoil here contained no coins.

³ Both these came actually from the *surface* of the floor.

Constantius II or Constans. *Fel. Temp. R* (PL~~///~~).
Worn. 4 Æ size, as foregoing.

Barbarous. *Fel. Temp. R* type. Worn. Small 4 Æ size
(0.8 cm.), but probably not clipped.

Honorius. Single Victory. Fair (i.e. usual) condition
4 Æ (not clipped, but inadequate flan).

House of Theodosius I. Single Victory. Worn. 4 Æ,
as foregoing.

The last six coins present no difficulty. They are the dregs of the fourth-century currency, which might be expected to have remained in circulation, and they commonly occur in Theodosian hoards. Moreover, the larger coin of Constantine I is not really a surprising find.

The radiates, however, are somewhat of a problem. The coins of Claudius II and Carausius are legitimate third-century issues. The former is somewhat worn on one side, but the obverse shows little trace of wear, whilst the Carausius coin is in mint condition. Incidentally the reverse of this seems to be an unrecorded type and both sides are double-struck⁴ (fig. 1). On account of their condition it cannot be supposed that these coins had been in circulation continuously from the date of their minting to the end of the fourth century. They must have been hoarded, above or below ground, presumably late in the third century, either when Aurelian's reforms amounted in effect to repudiation of the base issues of his predecessors, or later still in the time of Carausius or Allectus owing to a sense of insecurity.⁵ Many such hoards have been

⁴ *Obv.* IMP C CARAVSIVS [(P F) AVG] Bust radiate, draped, r.

Rev. LAETITIA AVG. Male figure moving r., headed, turned to l.

⁵ See Mr. Mattingly's remarks in *J.R.S.*, xxii, 93-4.

found in Britain in modern times; many more may have been retrieved at the close of the Roman occupation or later, and the coins again put into circulation at a time when bronze coinage was scarce. Here at least there is definite evidence for the renewed use of radiate issues in the late fourth century. How general this procedure was cannot as yet be determined, but the presence of the radiate head on *sceattas*, frequently remarked upon, seems to be significant.

The two other radiate coins amongst the eleven are barbarous copies and are also little worn. There seems no reason why the former of these should not have been a contemporary imitation, which, like the coins of Claudius II and Carausius, was hoarded and subsequently re-used. The second one, however, is a much smaller coin (6.5 mm. in diameter). The size of its flan is not due to clipping but to special preparation by stamping as practised for Theodosian 4 *Æ*. Moreover the design, which, especially on the obverse, is quite well executed, is correspondingly small. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that it was made but a short time before the date of its loss, the late fourth century or later. Mr. C. H. V. Sutherland has recently published⁶ an account of a hoard of similar coins from the Bristol district, which he would date on stylistic grounds to the fifth century. Here at Bourton in this deposit there is evidence of the re-use of radiate issues at the close of the Roman occupation, and there seems therefore no reason why they should not have been as freely imitated at that time as they were in the late third century. On the other hand, the discovery at

⁶ *Num. Chron.*, 1934, 92 ff.

Verulamium in a sealed third-century deposit of a hoard apparently identical in style and module with that from near Bristol shows that those criteria are by no means sufficient in order to determine the age of unstratified discoveries.⁷

The ascription of three of these radiate coins in their second period of use to the late fourth century may seem somewhat disquieting for archaeologists; for in unstratified deposits such issues, at least if legitimate, are usually taken at face value and put down as indicating occupation, frequently intensive, in the period A.D. 260-90. Undoubtedly the great majority of such finds should be interpreted in this manner, but there remains the other possibility.


It is hoped that a criterion in this respect may be supplied by the invariable clipping of the coins. Clipped coins are of common occurrence towards the end of the fourth century. There may have been a special reason for the clipping of some of the silver as found in certain Theodosian hoards,⁸ but the reason for clipping bronze coins seems to have been the increasing scarcity of the metal, which is also illustrated by the progressive diminution in size of Constantinian bronze issues. In Theodosian bronze hoards the earlier coins which occur are usually very badly clipped, sometimes to mere fragments, or, like the Constantinian coins in the present collection of eleven, are the dregs of the currency of the century, badly struck on inadequate flans. Three of the radiate coins in the present collection have been clipped, presumably for the same reason. At the later date they were

⁷ The writer is indebted for this information to Mrs. Wheeler.

⁸ See report on the S. Feriby Theodosian hoard, *supra*, pp. 254 ff.

unnecessarily big in their original state and the metal was valuable. If it should prove possible to establish that this is the invariable condition of radiate coins in use at the end of the Roman occupation,⁹ further evidence will be available for the study of the coinage of that period.

The coins of Claudius II and Carausius have been



clipped all round, so that they retain their circular shape and most of their legends. The coin of Carausius is particularly interesting, since it shows the exact method by which the clipping was done. The coin was held in the left hand and steadied with the right thumb, the cutting being done with a knife towards the person, as when peeling an apple or in one of the methods of sharpening a pencil. The jagged cuts of the knife, especially at the thicker side of the coin, are most noticeable to the touch. When the cutting was almost completed a small projection was left (see figure), apparently because, if the same method of cutting had been continued, there would have been

⁹ Such a condition is, however, of frequent occurrence amongst the radiate coins found at the Verulamium theatre in the sealed third-century layer, in which the radiate minim hoard was found (see above, p. 279).

danger of the knife slipping and cutting the right thumb. The clipping could, of course, have been completed in another manner, but was not. This amateurish and obviously unofficial method of clipping is in marked contrast with the chisel and hammer style, which seems to have been employed for the official clipping of some of the Theodosian silver coinage.¹⁰ The cruder method was doubtless in common use for bronze coins, but the present example seems to show the details so plainly as to be worthy of special mention.

B. H. ST. J. O'NEIL.

¹⁰ e.g. in the S. Ferriby Hoard, *v. sup.*, p. 260.

MISCELLANEA.

A SILVER STATER OF IDALIUM.



THIS stater was acquired by the Cyprus Museum from a young man in Nicosia whose birthplace is Idalium (modern Dali). According to his allegation, the stater was found in a field 500 yards SE. of the Acropolis of Idalium.¹ It belongs to class IV of Hill's classification,² attributed by the inscription βα'κα'ρα' to a king whose name seems to be *Kapas*, or *Γρας*.

Obv. Sphinx with curled wing seated l. on tendril, which rises beneath her belly to a bud, in front to an open flower, on which she places her r. foot, on l. † (λο'), r. †V (κα'ρα'); border of dots.

Rev. Lotus flower on two spiral tendrils; on l. outline of ivy-leaf; on r. astragalos: the whole in faint linear border, in incuse circle.

Wt. 171 gr.; 24.0 mm.

It is my intention to propose a new reading of the king's name, based on the evidence given by the stater above described, and a revision of the previous read-

¹ *J.H.S.* xlviii, 1928, p. 195.

² Hill, *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Cyprus*, p. li, Pl. V. 9-12.

ings.³ The new reading, from right to left, is according to the present specimen *Αρ·κα·λο·* or *Αργάλου*, which should be the name of the king.

The inscription \mp (on the left of the sphinx) and $\uparrow \nabla$ (on her right) has always been read from left to right and this is responsible for the reading adopted. The letters $\uparrow \nabla$ were read *Κα·ρα* or *Γα·ρα* and considered to be the name of the king, *Γρας*, but this was not accepted without some feeling of doubt.⁴ The stater described, which has the inscription $\mp \uparrow \nabla$, *λο·κα·ρα·*, gives the clue to the reading from right to left, in which case we would have *Αρ·κα·λο·*, i.e. *Αργάλου*. Now in the case of the stater with $\mp \uparrow \nabla$ *βα·κα·ρα·*, I suggest the same method of reading, i.e. *Αρ.κα.βα* or *Αρ·γα·βα·*, from which we get only the first two syllables of king Argalos's name and the first syllable of the word *βασιλεύς*.

We now come to the name *Αργαλος*. This was borne by the eldest son of Amyclas, his successor in the throne of Sparta.⁵ We know that there was in Idalium a temple of Apollo Amyclus or Amyclaeus.⁶ It is therefore not improbable that one of the kings of Idalium had the same name as the son of Amyclas, the founder of the town of Amyclae, the metropolis of the famous sanctuary of Apollo Amyclaeus.

P. ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ.

NOTE.—Mr. Dikaios has asked me to add a note on the reading proposed above. All the coins of this class which I have been able to examine in the Museum (*B.M.C. Cyprus*, p. 26,

³ Hill, *op. cit.*; Babelon, *Monnaies grecques et romaines*, Paris, 1910, t. ii, p. 763.

⁴ Babelon, p. 766.

⁵ Paus, iii. 1, 3.

⁶ Hill, p. xlviii.

nos. 10-19) and elsewhere are from the same obverse die, and so, as far as one can judge from the photograph, is the new stater. On several specimens the letter in field on l. appears to take the form \vdash , but this is usually when this letter is near the edge of the flan. On others it is undoubtedly \pm . Therefore, unless one letter has been altered into the other in the die, \pm is probably the correct reading. Such an alteration, however, would not be impossible; the apparently pointless changes on the die of the previous king $\text{K}\iota$ may be instanced, for which see pp. 182-3 above. But in any case since there is little reason to think that the name of a king Gras is contained in the dedication to Athena from Dali,⁷ the new reading $\text{A}\rho\kappa\alpha\beta\alpha$ is to be welcomed as an alternative giving a further choice of plausible names.

E. S. G. R.

A HOARD OF *MINIMI* FROM NEAR BOURTON-ON-THE-WATER (GLOS.).


THE late Dr. J. Moore of Bourton-on-the-Water was a tireless collector of any objects or information relating to the town. Amongst his collection of coins from Bourton and district is a small box, labelled *Minimi*, which contains twenty-three exceedingly small barbarous bronze coins such as are now sometimes termed *Minimissimi* since their identification at Lydney.¹

It is certain that they were found last century, probably over fifty years ago, and one must be grateful to the actual finder for his patience in recovering them at a time when their value was scarcely appreciated, and to Dr. Moore for his foresight in keeping them so carefully. The actual site of the discovery is not certain, but it seems to have been on Slaughter Farm and may have been at the Bourton Bridge villa, which was partially explored at about that time. Both these matters are fully discussed in the *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society*, vol. 56, pp. 133 ff. The coins have been presented to Cheltenham Municipal Museum by Dr. Walter Moore.

⁷ Bechtel, *Griech. Dialektinschr.*, No. 62; Hill, in *B.M.C. Cyprus*, p. xlviii, note 7.

¹ *Report of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries*, ix. (1932), 116 ff.

In the same article a list of weights and measurements is given with a detailed description. As will be seen from the illustration all the coins are of the smallest Lydney type (F), the modern coin, upon which fifteen are placed, being a farthing. The average weight is 0.0865 gm., the heaviest, no. 4 (a clipped piece), weighing 0.135 gm., and the lightest 0.022 gm. (a very thin flan). One or two of them are



9-23
laid on a farthing (enlarged 2 diam.).

thicker, and may have been made by cutting a bar of metal, as is suggested for the Lydney coins (*op. cit.*, pp.129-131).

Only eight of the coins are in any way legible, and on these, whenever a design can be discerned at all, it appears to be some portion of the *Fel. Temp. Reparatio* type with legionary spearing fallen horseman. No. 7, for instance, seems to show the hind-quarters of the horse, and its obverse has a head of diademed type.

No. 1 has for obverse what may be a diademed head, but the reverse shows clearly a cross and pellet design. Such a

type does not occur among the Lydney coins, but the device is to be found upon other contemporary objects. It occurs on the globe of the *Perpetuas* type of *siliqua* of Gratian and Theodosius I,² and on a ring in the British Museum.³ It has been found, also, on pottery of the late Roman period at Silchester and recently at Bourton-on-the-Water,⁴ where it may be dated to c. A.D. 400. Finally, a very similar device, on a larger scale, forms the reverse to a barbarous radiate obverse on a coin in the Richborough 1931 barbarous radiate hoard.⁵ It is difficult to resist the suggestion that there is a connexion between this device on late Roman coins and other objects and on silver pennies from the time of Offa onwards.

Owing to the lack of information regarding the find-spot the date of this hoard can be decided only by analogy. The Lydney hoard is plainly of the fifth century A.D. and there can be little doubt that this hoard also represents some of the coinage of the post-Roman period in Britain.

B. H. ST. J. O'NEIL.

THE "BIRMINGHAM HALFPENCE" OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

The pieces described by Atkins (pp. 385-95) as "Imitations of the Regal Coinage", miserable productions though nearly all of them are from the point of view of both artist and craftsman, nevertheless possess an historical interest of their own, if only because their very existence reveals the inadequate provision of small change by the Government, an omission of which we find complaint from time to time throughout the whole of our history.

As to this particular eighteenth-century series, the Statute of Geo. II, c. 28 (1755), against false money was generally taken as not including halfpennies and farthings in the baser metals. For a reason which will be given later, the wording of the Act was perhaps intentionally vague with regard to the copper currency.¹ This served as a protection

² *Num. Chron.*, 1915, 470, and Pl. XX. 11; and Pearce, *The Roman Coinage from A.D. 364 to 423*, pp. 47-8.

³ *B.M. Cat. Rings*, no. 1209.

⁴ *Trans. Bristol and Glouc. Arch. Soc.*, vol. 56, pp. 113-115.

⁵ The writer is indebted for this information to Mr. W. P. D. Stebbing and Mr. J. P. Bushe-Fox.

¹ Ruding, ii, 81.

to the "Imitations". Under cover of that immunity, however, the regal copper money, being of full weight, was steadily melted down by the counterfeiters to provide metal for their lighter issues; and the more of the former that went to the crucible the more their competition was reduced. Hence, by a Statute of 1771, the imitating of any of the "Tower Halfpence and Farthings", as the legal copper coins were termed,² was made a felony,³ then punishable by death. This probably explains the evasive, often grotesque, types and legends that occur on so many, and were supposed to help the utterers to cheat the gallows. The eighteenth-century year-dates placed on the reverses of most of these coins we need not accept very literally: a considerable proportion of them, indeed, are clearly impossible. They range from 1721 to 1798. The seventeenth-century dates which are found on a few are manifestly all fictitious. Six only of the halfpennies in Atkins's list bear the word "token", perhaps as an *altera securitas* against prosecution. The great majority of them seem to be earlier than the late eighteenth-century token series, but that some were contemporaneous with it is evident from these being light counterfeits of the genuine tokens, the copying of which involved no legal risk; for though the latter were, till the Act of 57 Geo. III, c. 46, winked at by the authorities, no penalty attached to forging them.

These "Birmingham Halfpence"⁴ are spoken of by Raspe⁵ as being fabricated by "shabby, dishonest, button-makers in the dark lanes of Birmingham and London". Similarly, "R.Y." in the *Gentleman's Magazine*⁶ writes of "the clumsy and paltry productions which are hourly issuing from every dirty alley in London or Birmingham". They were no doubt sold at a discount and passed by the buyers for their full nominal value. The farthings, being proportionately lighter than the halfpennies, would yield a still larger profit. Comparatively few "half-halfpennies", however, were struck. The toll-men at the turnpikes, to whom persons from all parts tossed these coppers as they passed, were an active medium of their circulation, for they would promptly get rid of them as change.⁷ The dies from which these rude pieces were stamped seem to have been treated

² Lord Liverpool, *Treatise on the Coins of the Realm*, 1805, p. 192.

³ Ruding, ii, 83.

⁴ Ruding, ii, 80, &c.

⁵ *Catalogue of Gems*, 1791, Introd, xlii.

⁶ Sept., 1796. ⁷ See "R.Y." in *Gent.'s Mag.*, Ap., 1797.

in such a way as to produce coins that appeared worn. It is said, too, that "it was the common practice of the dealers in this article to fry a pan-full every night after supper for the next day's delivery, thus darkening them, to make them look as if they had been in circulation".⁸ Presumably it was believed that this, and the preceding device, would inspire confidence in them: what apparently had been accepted before might as well be accepted again. With these tricks we may compare the custom followed by makers of false paper-money, who soil their forgeries so as to give them the appearance of much-used genuine notes. That these coins are now rarely found in sharp condition may be further due to the fact that they have not attracted the collector, and have been "knocking about" and roughly treated as beneath consideration.

In the latter years of the eighteenth century there was a glut of copper halfpence in the country, so over-industrious had the coiners been in providing for the wants of the people; and Pinkerton, writing in 1789,⁹ estimated that not the fiftieth part of the copper currency was legitimate.¹⁰ The strength of the position occupied by the irregular money may be learnt from the reason given why, in 1797, only twopenny and penny pieces were struck by the Mint. It was not considered desirable to drive the halfpenny and farthing tokens and the "Imitations" instantly out of circulation, because that would result in a sudden deficiency of small coppers, which would be a great inconvenience to the humbler classes, whose monetary dealings were for the most part in small sums; and "Boulton, with all his art and machinery could not supply such with sufficient expedition".¹¹ On the other hand, the poor were often sufferers from these light forgeries, for, being illiterate, they were unable to distinguish between them and the State moneys. Payment of wages was frequently made in the false coin, which was apt to be refused or discounted by shopkeepers. The issue of the more honest tokens of 1787-97 was really

⁸ *Letters from England by Don Manuel Alvarez Espriella, Translated from the Spanish* [actually written by Robert Southey], 2nd edn., London, 1808, ii, 62.

⁹ *Essay on Medals*, ii, 85.

¹⁰ See, too, Colquhoun, *Treatise on the Police of the Metropolis*, 1797.

¹¹ Lord Liverpool, *ibid.*, pp. 195-6. See, also, "Civis" in *Gent.'s Mag.*, Jan., 1797.

a public convenience (although, as we have seen, the types of many of them were soon copied on light flans). Moreover, the issuers of the tokens struck for currency¹² were usually known, and their coins commonly bore a pledge that they would be honoured.

The regal halfpence and farthings of 1799 were not struck in sufficiently large numbers to drive the irregular coinages out of circulation, and, under *Gresham's Law*, "the lean coins eat up the fat ones". It was the very large issue by the Government of all three denominations, penny, half-penny, and farthing, in 1806-7 that killed the eighteenth-century "Imitations" and the tokens too.

F. P. BARNARD.

A HOARD OF ROMAN DENARII FROM SPAIN (RAMALLAS)

An interesting hoard has recently come to England from Ramallas, about five miles east of Arellera in the province of Zamorra in Spain. It consists of three silver bangles and twenty-seven silver coins, Roman denarii, found together in an earthenware jar or pot, under a stone in a floor of what was probably once a Roman villa. The bangles and coins marked with an asterisk are now in the British Museum: The remainder are in the Ashmolean Museum.

On pp. 290-1 is a list of the denarii contained in the hoard, with references to the *British Museum Catalogue of Coins of the Roman Republic* by Grueber (*B.M.C.*) and to Babelon, *Description historique et chronologique des Monnaies de la République romaine* (*B.*), with the approximate dates assigned by each.

The earliest of these denarii can be dated approximately 130 or 125 to 120 B.C.; Babelon's estimate of the date of C. Cato, c. 149 B.C., is certainly too high. The latest should be the brilliant specimens of P. Carisius, struck at Emerita in or not very long after 25 B.C. The denarius of Augustus, then, with reverse shield, which shows some slight trace of wear, is perhaps to be dated a little earlier, as in *B.M.C. Republic*, rather than a little later as in *B.M.C. Empire*; but the attribution to Spain is preferable to the attribution to Gaul.

H. M.

¹² Many, of course, were medallic only, and many merely struck for collectors; while others were political manifestoes.

<i>Name of Moneyer</i>	<i>No. of specimens in hoard</i>	<i>B.M.C.</i>	<i>Date B.C.</i>	<i>B.</i>	<i>Date B.C.</i>
M. Marcus	1	i, 149, no. 1008	c. 124-103	ii, 185, no. 8	c. 119
M. Metellus	1	i, 175, no. 145	c. 94	ii, 269, no. 28	c. 122 ¹
L. Sertius	1	i, 127, no. 1649	c. 89	ii, 437, no. 1	c. 89 ²
P. Servilius Rullus	1	i, 230, no. 167	c. 89	ii, 450, no. 14	c. 89 ²
C. Cato	2	ii, 249, no. 461	c. 150-125	ii, 368, no. 1	c. 149 ³
Q. Fabius Labeo	1	ii, 264, no. 494	c. 102-100	i, 489, no. 1	c. 144 ⁴
Q. Thermus	1	ii, 302, no. 653	c. 90	ii, 235, no. 19	c. 90
C. Vibius	3	i. 290, as no. 2244 (but symbol, torch on 1*, uncertain 2)	c. 87	ii, 539, no. 2	c. 90
M'. Fonteius	1	i, 322, no. 2476	c. 85	i, 306, no. 9	c. 88
L. Julius Bursio	1	i, 324, as on 2485 (but symbol, basket*)	c. 85	ii, 6, no. 5 (symbol 124)	c. 88
Q. Antonius Balbus	1	i, 347, no. 2765	c. 82	i, 157, no. 1	c. 82
Kalenus & Cordus	1	i, 415, no. 3358	c. 72	i, 512, no. 1	c. 82
P. Galba	1	i, 433, no. 3516	c. 69	ii, 473, no. 6	c. 69
Q. Pomponius Musa	1	i, 445, no. 3628	c. 67	ii, 365, no. 22	c. 64

Brutus	1	i, 479, no. 3861	c. 59	ii, 114, no. 31	c. 43-42 ⁵
Caesar	1	ii, 390, no. 27	c. 50-49	ii, 10, no. 9	c. 50
L. Hostilius Saserna	1	i, 512, no. 3988	c. 49	i, 553, no. 5	c. 46
Caesar	1	ii, 368, no. 86	c. 45	ii, 11, no. 11	c. 50
L. Aemilius Buca	1	i, 546, no. 4157	c. 44	i, 124, no. 17	c. 44
P. Clodius	1	i, 556, no. 4290	c. 38	i, 355, no. 14	c. 43 ⁶
M. Barbatius	1	ii, 490, no. 100	c. 41	i, 236, no. 2	c. 41-40
Augustus—P. Carisius	2	ii, 375, no. 112* ⁷ (but <i>rev</i> PRO PR not IRO PR). p. 375*, no. 16	c. 24-22	i, 318, no. 16; 319, no. 18 AVGVST) ⁸	c. 25
Augustus	1	ii, 416, no. 119	c. 29-27	i, 57, no. 133	?

¹ Babelon's date is preferable.² Hardly before c. 130 B.C.³ Babelon's date is preferable.⁴ *B.M.C. Emp.*, i, p. 56, no. 309, c. 22-19 B.C.⁵ Both these dates should probably be put twenty years up.⁶ Probably c. 125 B.C.⁷ *B.M.C. Emp.*, i, p. 31, no. 279, p. 52, no. 283, c. 25-23 B.C.⁸ The date of *B.M.C.* is preferable.

A NOTE ON THE HARKIRKE FIND

In the description of the Harkirke find of Anglo-Saxon coins written by the late W. S. Churchill (*Transactions of the Lancashire and Cheshire Antiquarian Society*, v (1887), 219-30) there are some comments on the apparent inexactness of the representations of the coins on the copperplate executed for Mr. Blundell, the first owner, which is the chief source of information as to the hoard. What seems to be the original drawing from which the copperplate was derived has now come to light in the second volume of Brian Twine's collectanea (MS. C.C.C. Oxon. 255, ff. 82-3); it is headed, in what is probably the hand of the draughtsman, "Certayne Coynes founde in a parcell of Lande called Harkirke within the Lordship of little Crosbie in the parish of Sephton in the county of Lancaster Anno 1611 Aprill 8"; this is followed by a note in Twine's hand, "this parcell of land is enclosed by Will. Blundell of little Crosby Esquyre for the buriall of Catholike Recusants that shall be denied buriall else where".

Comparison of the drawing with the plate shows that the former is clearly a more faithful representation of the coins: the draughtsman has given them of actual size and with careful attention to irregularities of lettering, while the engraver enlarged them, as noted by Mr. Churchill, and tried to produce a neat uniformity in the legends.

That the drawing was for the use of an engraver is confirmed by a note on the second page, in the same hand as the heading, "Note that the twentieth and the twenty fith coines should change places in this table"—a change which was duly made in the plate.

The draughtsman did not trouble to recopy a type which occurred in more than one example: in place of the reverses of 21, 23, 24, 26, and 27, there is a circle with the note "conuenit in omnibus cum fig. b. num. 19", and similar references in the cases of the obverse of 25 (corrected to 20) to that of 14, and of the obverse of 34 to that of 33. The engraver repeated each type in full.

The arrangement of the coins in the form of a cross on the copperplate seems to have been due to the engraver; it is not suggested by the drawing.

J. G. M.

INDEX.

A.

- 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān, coins of, 122-126
 Adramyttium, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 198-199
 Agrigentum, real scene of labours of Empedocles, 92-93
 Alexander III of Scotland, his types copied in Lorraine, 208
 ALLAN, JOHN.
 A new sterling of Lorraine, 208
 ALLOTTE DE LA FUYE, COLONEL.
 Monnaies inédites des Kāk-wayhids, 68-72.
 Alton *see* Blackmoor
 Amasia,* coins of, in the Ashmolean, 191
 Amastris, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 193
 Ambracia, new coins of, 6-11
 —, attribution corrected 12
 Amesbury, Roman coins and rings from, 260-261
 Amisus, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 192
 Andronicus III, Anna and John V, nomisma of, 232-40
 Antioch, the coinages of Gordian III in, 102-105; and Philip I, 105-108
 — (Pisidiae), coins of, 109
 Apamea, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 194
 Apollonia, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 200
 Arcadius, coins of, from South Ferriby, 268
 Argalos (?), king of Idalium, 282-284
 Ashmolean Museum, coins of Northern Asia Minor in the, 191-201
 Attaca, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 200

B.

- BARNARD, F. P.
 The "Birmingham" halfpence of the eighteenth century, 286-289

- Bays Meadow, Droitwich, Roman ring from, 258-259
 "Birmingham" halfpence of the eighteenth century, 286-289
 Bithynia, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 194
 Blackmoor, Roman coins from, in Curtis Museum, Alton, 55-56
 Bourton-on-the-Water, late Roman coins from, 275-281; *minimissimi* from, 284-286
 British Museum, Oriental coins in the, 241-253
 Brooke, G. C., noble of Edward IV presented to the British Museum in memory of, 135-136

C.

- Calchedon, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 195
 Campbell, General (Sir James), issued currency for Ionian Islands, 48-49.
 Carausius, coin of, from Bourton-on-the-Water, 276
 Carthage, Roman coins from, 53-54
 Champion, Alexander, Plassey medal given to, 128
 Citium, coins of, 167, 176
 Cius, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 195
 Clipped Roman coins, 269-273, 279
 Cnut, coins of, found in Sweden, 44-45
 Comana, coin of, in the Ashmolean, 192
 Commune Bithyniae, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 194
 Constantine VII, history and coinage of, 114-119
 Constantius II, coins of, from South Ferriby, 262
 Coreyra, pegasus of, 12-13
 Corinth, gold trihemobols of, 1-6; overstruck coins of, 14
 Creteia, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 196

Cromna, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 193
 Cyprus, find of coins of, 165-190
 Curtis Museum *see* Blackmoor

D.

DIEUDONNÉ, A.
 Le Hardi et le Liard, 25-37
 DIKAIOS, P. M.
 A hoard of Cypriot staters from Larnaca, 165-179
 A silver stater of Idalium, 282-283
 Dorset *see* Fifehead Neville
 Droitwich *see* Bays Meadow

E.

Edward IV, the Brooke memorial noble of, 135-136
 Ethelred II, coins of, found in Sweden, 43-44
 Empedocles, the story of his work at Selinus criticized, 73-93
 Eugenius, coins of, from South Ferriby, 268

F.

Fifehead Neville (Dorset), Roman rings from, 259
 Fincham, Roman coins found at, 67-68
 FINDS OF COINS.
 Amesbury (Roman), 259-260
 Asia Minor (late Roman), 21-25
 Blackmoor (third century), 55-56
 Bourton-on-the-Water (Roman), 275-281
 Cai : : : : :), 53-54
 Edlington (Roman), 202-207
 Fincham (Roman), 67-68
 Harkirke (Anglo-Saxon), 292
 Larnaca (Cypriote), 165-190
 Linwood (Roman), 57-62
 Ramallas *see* Spain
 St. Mary Cray (Roman), 62-67
 South Ferriby (Roman) 252-274
 Spain (Roman), 289-291
 Torlarp (Anglo-Saxon), 42-45
 Whitechurch (radiate minimi), 16-21
 Whorlton (Roman), 258-259

Woodbridge (fourth century A.D.), 49-53
 Flavius Victor, coins of, from South Ferriby, 266

G.

Gaupp, G. F., Plassey medal awarded to, 129
 Gaziura, coin of, in the Ashmolean, 192
 Germanicopolis, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 193
 Gilbert, moneyer of Newark, 38-41
 GOODACRE, HUGH.
 The story of Constantine VII, Porphyrogenitus, from his solidi, 114-119
 — A nomisma of Andronicus III, Anna and John V, 282-240
 Gratian, coins of, from South Ferriby, 265; portraiture of, at Treveri, 143-146

H.

Hadrianotherae, coin of, in the Ashmolean, 201
 Hajjaj b. Yūsuf, coin weight of, 246-248
 Harashī, governor of Ṭabaristān, coin of, 251-253
 Hardi, origin of the name, 25-37
 Harkirke Find of Anglo-Saxon coins, 292
 Harrington farthing, document ordering currency of, 45-47
 Henry II, Tealby penny of Newark of, 38-41
 Heraclea, pegasus of, 13
 Heraclea (Bithyniae), coins of, in the Ashmolean, 196
 Himera, coins of; and relations with Selinus, 82-91
 Honorius, coins of, from South Ferriby, 262-268

I.

Idalium, coins of, from Larnaca, 167, 176; a silver stater of, 282-284
 Imitations of George III half-pence, 286-289
 Ionian Islands, first British coinage for, 47-49

J.

Julian II, coins of, from South Ferriby, 262-263

K.

Kākwayhids, coins of the, 68-72
Khusrau II, coin of, with solar deity on reverse, 242-245

L.

Lambros, Paul, on coinage of Ionian Islands quoted, 48-49
Lapethus, coins of, from Larnaca, 168-170, 176-177
Larnaca, Cypriote hoard from, 165-190

LAWRENCE, L. A.

A new mint for the first issue of Henry II, 38-41
The Brooke Memorial, 135-136
A note on serrated coins, 230-231

Liard, origin of the name, 25-37
Linwood (March), Roman coins found at, 57-62

LLOYD, A. H.

The coin types of Selinus and the legend of Empedocles, 73-93

Locri, overstruck coins of, 14
Lorraine, sterling of copied from Scots penny, 208

M.

Magnus Maximus, coins of, from South Ferriby, 266; portraiture of, at Treveri, 150-153

March see Linwood

MATTINGLY, HAROLD.

A hoard of Roman denarii from Spain (Ramallas), 289-291

MILNE, J. GRAFTON.

A note on the Harrington farthing, 45-47

Notes on the Oxford Collection of Greek coins of Northern Asia Minor, 191-201

A note on the Harkirke Find, 292

Mir Ja'far's Plassey medal, 127-134

Moore, Dr. J., of Bourton-on-the Water, his coins, 284-286

Mukātil b. Misma', coin of, 250
Multān, so-called Sun god of, 244-245

N.

Neocaesarea, coin of, in the Ashmolean, 192

Newark, mint of Henry II, 38-41

Nicaea, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 196-198

Nicomedia, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 198

Norfolk, Roman coins from Fincham, 67-69

O.

O'NEIL, B. H. ST. J.

An earlier find near St. Mary Cray, 66-67

The South Ferriby Theodosian Hoard, 254-274

Some stratified coins of c. A.D. 390-400 from Bourton-on-the-Water, 275-285

Orpington see St. Mary Cray

P.

Paphos, coins of, from Larnaca, 170-172

PEARCE, J. W. E.

A late Roman Hoard from South-west Asia Minor, 21-28

Late fourth-century Hoard of "Aes 4" from Woodbridge, 49-53

Further notes on some Aes of Valentinian II and Theodosius, 72

Siliqua issues at Treveri from the death of Valens to the accession of Magnus Maximus, 137-164

PERSON, ERIK.

Anglo-Saxon coins in the Find of Torlarp, Sweden, 42-45

PINK, KARL.

Antioch or Viminacium? 94-113

Plassey, Mir Ja'far's medal for, 127-134

Pontus, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 191

Prusias, coin of, in the Ashmolean, 193

R.

- Ramallas (Spain), Roman coins from, 289-291
- RAVEL, O.
 Unpublished coins of Corinthian types, 1-15
- ROBERTSON, Miss ANNE S.
 The Linwood (March) Hoard, 57-62
 The St. Mary Cray Hoard, 62-67
 The Edlington Wood Find, 202-207
- ROBINSON, E. S. G.
 Notes on the Larnaca Hoard, 180-190
 A note on a stater of Idalium, 283-284

S.

- St. Mary Cray, Roman coins found at, 62-67
- Salamis, coins of, from Larnaca, 172-173, 177-178
- Scythopolis, a Byzantine mint, 120-126
- Sebastopolis, coin of, in the Ashmolean, 193
- Selinus, coins of, and the legend of Empedocles, 73-93
- Serrated coins, origin of Roman, 298-231; lists of, 216-219
- Shahpūr, son of Pāpak, coin of, 241-242
- Sinope, coins of, in the Ashmolean, 194
- South Ferriby, Roman coins from, 260-274; ring from, 257-258
- Spain, Roman coins from, 289-291
- SUTHERLAND, C. H. V.
 The Whitechurch Hoard of radiate minimi, 16-21
 Hoard of Constantinian Third Brass from Carthage, 53-54
- SYDENHAM, Rev. E. A.
 The origin of the Roman serrati, 209-231

T.

- Tabaristān, coin of al-Ḥarashī, Governor of, 251-253
- Theodosius I, coins of, from South Ferriby, 267-268; portraiture of, at Treveri, 149-150
- Tium, coin of, in the Ashmolean, 198
- Treveri, the mint of A.D. 378-383, 137-164

U.


- ʿUbaidallah b. Ziyād, coins of, 249-258

V.

- Valens, coins of, from South Ferriby, 261-264
- Valentinian I, coins of, from South Ferriby, 264
- Valentinian II, coins of, from South Ferriby, 266-267; portraiture of, at Treveri, 147-149
- Viminacium, coins of, 109-110

W.

- WALKER, JOHN.
 A new Byzantine mint and some early Umayyad bronze coinages, 120-126
 Some recent Oriental coin acquisitions of the British Museum, 241-253
- Walsh, John, medal for Plassey given to, 129
- Whitechurch, Roman coins from, 49-53
- WHITEHEAD, R. B.
 Mir Jafar's Plassey medal, 127-134
- Whoriton (Yorks), Roman coins and silver from, 258
- Witney (Oxfordshire), document ordering currency of Harrington farthing, 45-47
- WOOD, HOWLAND.
 The first British coinage for the Ionian Islands, 47-49



2

1

3




4




5

5



6


6



8


7

8









Archaeological Library

57926

Call No.

737.05/N.E.

Author—

Numismatic Chronicle.

Title—

Vol. 15, Pls. 2-4, 1925.

Borrower No.

Date of Issue

Date of Return

"A book that is shut is but a block"

CENTRAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
GOVT. OF INDIA
Department of Archaeology
NEW DELHI

Please help us to keep the book
clean and moving.